

Graham	Luther	Roukema
Green	Maloney	Roybal-Allard
Greenwood	Manton	Royce
Gunderson	Manzullo	Rush
Gutierrez	Markey	Sabo
Gutknecht	Martinez	Salmon
Hall (TX)	Martini	Sanford
Hamilton	Mascara	Saxton
Hancock	Matsui	Scarborough
Hansen	McCarthy	Schaefer
Hastert	McCollum	Schiff
Hastings (FL)	McCrery	Scott
Hastings (WA)	McDade	Seastrand
Hayes	McDermott	Sensenbrenner
Hayworth	McHugh	Serrano
Hefley	McIntosh	Shadegg
Heineman	McKeon	Shaw
Herger	McKinney	Shays
Hilleary	McNulty	Shuster
Hilliard	Meek	Sisisky
Hinchey	Menendez	Skeen
Hobson	Metcalfe	Skelton
Hoekstra	Meyers	Smith (MI)
Hoke	Mfume	Smith (NJ)
Holden	Mica	Smith (TX)
Horn	Miller (FL)	Smith (WA)
Hostettler	Minge	Solomon
Houghton	Mink	Souder
Hoyer	Moakley	Spence
Hunter	Molinari	Spratt
Hutchinson	Mollohan	Stearns
Hyde	Montgomery	Stenholm
Inglis	Moorhead	Stockman
Istook	Morella	Studds
Jackson-Lee	Murtha	Stump
Jacobs	Myers	Talent
Johnson (CT)	Myrick	Tanner
Johnson, E. B.	Nadler	Tate
Johnson, Sam	Nethercutt	Tauzin
Johnston	Neumann	Taylor (MS)
Jones	Ney	Taylor (NC)
Kanjorski	Norwood	Tejeda
Kaptur	Nussle	Thomas
Kasich	Ortiz	Thompson
Kelly	Oxley	Thornberry
Kennelly	Packard	Thornton
Kildee	Parker	Thurman
Kim	Pastor	Tiahrt
King	Paxon	Torkildsen
Kingston	Payne (VA)	Torricelli
Klecza	Peterson (FL)	Trafficant
Klink	Petri	Upton
Klug	Pickett	Volkmer
Knollenberg	Pombo	Vucanovich
Kolbe	Porter	Walker
LaFalce	Portman	Walsh
LaHood	Poshard	Wamp
Largent	Pryce	Ward
Latham	Quillen	Watt (NC)
LaTourette	Quinn	Watts (OK)
Laughlin	Radanovich	Weldon (FL)
Lazio	Rahall	Weller
Leach	Ramstad	White
Levin	Reed	Whitfield
Lewis (CA)	Regula	Wicker
Lewis (GA)	Riggs	Williams
Lewis (KY)	Rivers	Wise
Lightfoot	Roberts	Wolf
Lincoln	Roemer	Woolsey
Linder	Rogers	Wynn
Lipinski	Rohrabacher	Yates
LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (AK)
Longley	Rose	Young (FL)
Lucas	Roth	Zeliff

## NAYS—70

Andrews	Gejdenson	Owens
Baldacci	Gonzalez	Pallone
Becerra	Hall (OH)	Payne (NJ)
Brown (OH)	Harman	Pelosi
Bryant (TX)	Hefner	Peterson (MN)
Cardin	Jefferson	Pomeroy
Clay	Johnson (SD)	Rangel
Collins (IL)	Kennedy (MA)	Richardson
Collins (MI)	Kennedy (RI)	Sanders
Costello	Lantos	Sawyer
Coyne	Livingston	Schroeder
DeFazio	Lofgren	Schumer
Dellums	Lowey	Skaggs
Deutsch	McHale	Slaughter
Durbin	Meehan	Stark
Edwards	Miller (CA)	Stokes
Engel	Moran	Stupak
Fattah	Neal	Torres
Filner	Oberstar	Towns
Ford	Obey	Vento
Frank (MA)	Olver	
Furse	Orton	

Visclosky	Waxman	Wyden
Waters	Weldon (PA)	Zimmer

## NOT VOTING—5

McInnis	Velazquez	Wilson
Tucker	Waldholtz	

## □ 1728

Messrs. NEAL of Massachusetts, JEFFERSON, and TOWNS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. ESHOO, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. YATES changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## UNITED STATES TROOP DEPLOYMENTS IN BOSNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the first section of House Resolution 304, it is now in order to debate the subject of the deployment of Armed Forces in Bosnia.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

## □ 1730

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have come to this point in our debate over United States policy on Bosnia because the Clinton administration has resolutely declined to provide the necessary leadership.

In this campaign for President, Mr. Clinton stated that he favored using military force, if necessary, to ensure that food and other relief supplies could reach the desperate people of Bosnia. After his election in November 1992, President Clinton followed the lead of the United Nations and our European allies.

During that period, a number of us in the Congress sought to ease the suffering of the Bosnian Moslems by repealing the arms embargo that put them at such a terrible disadvantage.

Our legislation would have permitted the equipping and training of the Bosnians so that they could defend themselves.

The Government of Bosnia pleaded with our Government to do just that, to lift the immoral arms embargo the United Nations imposed with our Government's support.

In meetings with the President, again and again we strongly urged lifting the arms embargo, but the President did not act because our NATO allies opposed it.

The best we could obtain was enactment of legislation late last year that required our Nation to stop enforcing the embargo against other countries.

Had the arms embargo been lifted, we would not now be confronted with sending our troops to enforce a peace plan that raises more questions than it has answered.

Hundreds of our troops are now in Bosnia even as we speak. Thousands more will soon follow. Short of passing a law to cut off funds—which the Senate has declined to do—and which the President would veto anyway—we cannot prevent this deployment.

The administration has yet to convince the American people that we have a vital national interest in Bosnia that warrants the possible sacrifice of American lives there.

The American people have registered their overwhelming opposition to sending our forces on a mission whose purposes remain murky, and whose outcome is uncertain.

As the House debates the measures before it today, we must consider how to balance our opposition to the policy of deploying our forces to Bosnia with our support for the men and women who are being ordered into a real-life Mission Impossible.

In his speech to the Nation, the President stated that providing more than 20,000 American ground troops for the NATO implementation force is vital for the Bosnian peace plan to succeed.

The President stated that our mission would have realistic goals achievable in a definite period of time—1 year.

While the President has specified a time frame, he has not spelled out the criteria for success, or our options if those criteria are not met. There is an exit date, but no exit strategy.

The peace plan is complex and complicated. It states that our main military task will be to separate the warring factions from the lines of confrontation, and keep them behind boundaries that will partition Bosnia into two entities. If the factions do not comply, our troops are authorized to forcibly remove them. How does this differ from fighting a war, which the President has assured us is not our objective?

Justice Richard Goldstone, the Chief Prosecutor of the War Crimes Tribunal, has told us that there can be no peace in Bosnia without justice for the victims of war crimes.

The peace plan describes an elaborate framework for investigating and assigning responsibility for human rights abuses, but is silent on how its findings will be enforced. Will our troops be called upon to bring the guilty to justice? If not, who will?

The President has argued that failure to keep his commitment to send troops to Bosnia will undermine future United States leadership and NATO's credibility.

But what will happen if, when the year is up and the President prepares to withdraw our troops, our NATO allies object, saying that the mission is incomplete? Do we stay, or go anyway?

Mr. Speaker, the votes we cast today will long be remembered in the history books of our Nation. Our votes must reflect our best judgments of the risks that this mission entails, of the soundness of the policy behind it, the potential for success and the price of failure.

How many Members of Congress who voted for the Tonkin Gulf resolution in 1964 have since said that was the one vote they wished they could take back?

Mr. Speaker, let us hope that, in the months ahead, our colleagues do not say that they wish they could have back any of the votes they cast on this issue today.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important debate for the House today. Putting American troops in harm's way is as serious a decision as government makes. It is a decision that should be made not only by the President, but also by the Congress, so it is good that we are having the debate.

I should say at the outset that my preference is that the House vote today to support the U.S. troops and the mission in Bosnia. I think that kind of a decision should be a collective judgment of the Congress and the President; and when the Congress shares responsibility, the decision is stronger, sounder, and better able to withstand the shifting political winds and circumstance.

Let me state, as briefly as I can, why I think the deployment of troops to Bosnia is worthwhile. First, I think it is quite clear that the United States participation is essential to peace. All of the parties here, the Muslims, the Croats, the Serbs, and so far as I know all the countries in the world, none in opposition, agree that without American leadership, there would be no peace agreement; that without American troop participation, the peace agreement would simply fall apart; and that without U.S. involvement, the killing would resume and the war risks spread.

I also think that U.S. interests are very much at stake here. The question of Bosnia is now bigger than Bosnia. It has become a key test of American leadership, and having brokered the peace agreement, we cannot walk away. Bosnia is a test of U.S. leadership in the world. If we do not go in, our credibility sinks and our reliability collapses.

This Dayton agreement is not perfect. Some say it is not just. But the president of Bosnia has it right: This peace agreement is more just than a continuation of the war, peace is better than more war.

Mr. Speaker, this agreement supports U.S. interests in many ways. It stops the killing, it maintains a single unitary Bosnia state, it protects human rights, it reunifies Sarajevo, it allows refugees to return, it obligates the parties to participate and cooperate fully with the War Crimes Tribunal, it certainly avoids more war, it strengthens

and preserves NATO and maintains U.S. leadership in NATO.

I believe the mission is doable. The mission for IFOR will be limited with a clearly states military task. The mission will be NATO-led, operating under clear, unified command and control with robust rules of engagement. heavily armed, well-trained U.S. troops will take their orders from an American general who commands NATO. Its mission is limited and targeted.

The purpose of this limited military mission is to establish a stable and secure environment so that others, not IFOR, can do the important tasks of reconstruction and reconciliation.

It is important to recognize what the mission is not, and there must be no mission creep. Our troops must not deliver humanitarian assistance, they must not serve as a nation-building force, they must not be a police force, they must not be responsible for election security. Those are all important and even critical tasks, but they will be performed by the civilian component of the peace process, and the Europeans will play the leading role there and pick up most of the costs.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the risks here are shared and acceptable. There is not any doubt that the U.S. troops will face risks, but those risks are acceptable and the mission can be achieved.

The costs and risks of failing to act are far greater: war instead of peace, not only in Bosnia but possibly in Europe, a crippled NATO alliance, and the United States not leading but staying on the sidelines.

We do not bear these risks alone. We share these risks with our closest NATO allies. We supply one-third of the troops. NATO and other countries provide the other two-thirds. I believe that there is no real alternative that has been enunciated by the opponents of the President's policy.

□ 1745

Mr. HAMILTON. So far as I can determine, those who oppose the present policy simply do not have an alternative. What would they have us do? how would they maintain U.S. leadership, U.S. credibility, and U.S. reliability? How would they stop the fighting? How would they aid the injured? How would they create stability? How old they provide hope?

I believe, in this situation, that the United States can make a difference. Americans are understandably conflicted about this mission, and they have every right to be skeptical and to demand answers to their concerns. They do not want the United States to become the world's policeman, and there are many conflict in the world where we are not involved. But where we can make a difference for peace, where our action can stop a war, where our action can stop the killing, where the costs and the risks are manageable, we should act.

Finally, the United States, and this may be the most important point of

all, must remain, in the conduct of its American foreign policy, reliable and credible. When we come right down to it, foreign policy is all about reliability. The United States will only be taken seriously in the world if we are seen as reliable; if we are viewed as standing up to our commitments in Bosnia or elsewhere. If the United States does not participate in IFOR, the United States will not taken seriously, its standing in the world is weakened. The consequence then of not voting to support the policy in Bosnia is, in my view, to undermine U.S. security because we undermine the reliability and the credibility of U.S. foreign policy.

No one knows whether this effort will succeed. no one is satisfied with all aspects of the Dayton agreement. There are no guarantees. But I urge the Members to support the policy and, of course, to support the troops.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] a member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I respectfully disagree with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON]. We have advocated an alternative to this policy for years. We have had a policy in the United States of an arms embargo against the victims of aggression for all of these years. The years go on and on, and yet the architects of that failed policy, which brought genocide, which brought mass killings, which brought aggression, now those architects of that failed policy tell us we have to send our young people into the Balkans, and we have not had an alternative.

We have been advocating an alternative all along. The fact is the architects of that failed policy now want to deploy tens of thousands of young Americans into the bloody Balkans when they helped make the bloody Balkans, and they want to put then right in the heart of the conflict.

I will be supporting the Dornan bill, which is the only binding legislation that we have to choose from of the three bills that we will choose from today. The other bills, just for the public knowledge, are show bills. They will give Members a chance for cover. The bill offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is the only that will stop a deployment, if indeed, it was enacted into law.

I will have to let my fellow Members know what that means. The House of Representatives should understand that the vote that we will take that is going to take place will be characterized by the President, if the Dornan bill goes down, as support of his deployment of Americans into the Balkans. That is what he has done with the vote in the Senate.

When the Senate voted down the Hefley bill today, the White House said, "That was probably the strongest statement of support they could possibly make. Having voted overwhelmingly not to shut off funding, is in a

sense supporting the President's judgment."

If my colleagues want it on their record that they voted for the Gulf of Tonkin resolution of the Balkans, go right ahead and vote against the bill offered by the gentleman from California. We do not want to send our young people into that meat grinder that has absolutely no goals in mind, just to have an American presence. That is insane.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CLEMENT].

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in a very uplifting and inspiring address, Prime Minister Peres of Israel characterized the 20th century as the American Century. As the end of the 20th century approaches, Americans can look back and feel proud of what we have accomplished in the past 96 years. The United States has compiled a list of foreign policy successes which is unrivaled in the modern world, including squelching the threats of nazism and communism, and the recent strides made toward lasting peace in the Middle East, South Africa, and Northern Ireland. All of these successes share the same values—American values—on which this great country was built: freedom and democracy. Yes, this truly is the American Century.

Now, the United States has been called on again, not to make war, but to make peace. Peace in a place where many felt it would never be achieved. We have all seen the atrocities on television, the rapes and murders of innocent civilians. After 3½ years, the fighting in Bosnia has left 250,000 people dead and 2 million more homeless. Yet here we are, on the verge of a unilateral peace agreement in war-torn Bosnia which will be formally signed tomorrow in Paris. We should be proud as Americans that our country's leadership has made this settlement possible. Now that the leaders of Bosnia, Croatia, and Serbia have reached agreement on the principles of freedom and democracy, it is up to the United States to take the next step, and following through with our commitment to help enforce these peace provisions. Let us all pray that this peace agreement will be kept by all parties.

The political upheaval of the former Soviet Union has left the United States, and its democratic foundation, in a position of world leadership. We are the last superpower. With this leadership comes responsibilities, and helping to ensure the stability of Europe.

I find it reprehensible that when the drawn of peace in Central Europe is upon us and our troops are already risking their lives to forge out this peace in Bosnia's hilly and dangerous terrain, some of my colleagues wish to cut off funding to the American troops.

Congress has the opportunity to do the right thing. Support the President, support the troops, support American values, and support peace in Bosnia. My colleagues, it is time to give peace

a chance. The American Century is far from over.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS].

(Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express strong concern about sending U.S. troops to Bosnia and in support of the Dornan amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I have said that I would not object to sending troops to Bosnia if we had a really rock-solid peace agreement, but we do not have a rock-solid peace agreement.

President Tudjman has signed for Croatia, but he had an agenda. They got Slavonia back. President Milosevic has signed for Serbia, but he also had an agenda. He wanted to end the embargo. The only one who has signed for Bosnia is President Izetbegovic. No one has spoken for the Bosnian Serbs; no one for the Bosnian Croats. I think that, in fact, Mladic has spoken against this agreement on behalf of the Bosnian Serbs.

The argument about not abandoning the troops in the field I think is just not valid. The troops are not there yet. We have maybe 100 troops in Tuzla. By this time 6 months from now, we will have thousands there. Now is the time to speak.

Mr. Speaker, this war and the Vietnam war were very different, but in some ways, in one way at least, they are very similar. Do we never learn anything? We found out in Vietnam that we cannot and we should not fight a war that the American people do not support. I do not think that that support is here.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I think we should look at what will we accomplish? I firmly believe that if we leave in a year, and I say if we leave in a year, the fighting will not only resume, but will be much more violent, because all the parties will have had a year to rearm and to develop supplies.

Mr. Speaker, I support the Dornan amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR].

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, the debate here today is not about sending troops to Bosnia. Our troops are in Bosnia, and tomorrow more will go, and Friday even more will go. In fact, yesterday afternoon I was with many of my colleagues having lunch with those troops in Frankfurt, Germany, and what they asked is for us to support what they are doing.

Mr. Speaker, those troops are trained. They are prepared to go. They are eager to go. In fact, the ones I had lunch with said, "I want to do the job that I am trained for."

This debate here tonight is not about war in Bosnia. It is a debate about whether Americans will stand up to implement a peace plan—a peace plan

that we led. The agreement was written in Dayton. This agreement is one of the most interesting contracts ever done in the modern world. It sets out a whole process for how the military aspects will be involved in the peace settlement; how to stabilize the region; how to enter into boundary disputes; how to prepare for elections; a new constitution is written.

It sets up a system of arbitration of differences and sets up a commission for human rights and petitioning that commission. It is how to deal with refugees and displaced persons, including just compensation for taken property. It sets up a commission to preserve the national monuments and sets up public corporations for Bosnia and Herzegovina.

It sets up a civilian implementation plan to transfer from war to civil governments; it sets up an international policy for police task forces.

Mr. Speaker, this is an agreement that is signed by all the leaders. This is a contract on how we get from here to there. And when it is over, we stabilize the Balkans. Sure, there is some risk. But we are in a world where leadership is about getting something done, and the United States has gotten something done. We have ended the war; peace has broken out.

Mr. Speaker, to walk away from this would be a travesty. All the generals that we talked to, and the admirals that are going to be involved in this, urged our delegation to support the troops. As Admiral Snuffy Smith, who is going to be in command, told us, "I'll tell you why I want you to support us. Because we're big, we're good, and we deliver. We'll get in, we'll get the job done, and we'll get out."

Twenty-eight nations are already involved in the IFOR process. It would be a travesty for our military to walk away from all of those other troops whose mothers and fathers are just as concerned as our mothers and fathers about their sons and daughters serving there.

Mr. Speaker, it would be a travesty for diplomacy. Every ambassador that we talked to said this is the right thing. This peace accord is amazing. It is a great document. We ought to be supporting.

Last, the Presidents whose countries are involved, whose citizens suffered the war, all stated, "We signed this document. We are going to implement it. We want it to work. We are sick and tired of war. We do not want it to continue. We want to be back in the nation of economic prosperity. We have the talent to do that. Give us the chance."

Let peace prevail. Support our troops. Reject the Dornan amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I have one North Star that my eyes are going to be fixed on during the next 3 hours, and that is what I will say to a young

widow or Gold Star Mother or some young child who has lost their dad or their mom for the rest of their life.

There has been a lot of confusion around here in the last couple of hours. It appears that Clinton is on his way to Europe again. The plane takes off in about a minute from Andrews. He is going to be calling the Democratic cloakroom, or somewhere, regularly to see if this House is going to give him the power that he took unconstitutionally, without coming to the Senate or the U.S. House of Representatives for permission to do this.

I remember when the Vietnam war went down the tubes and the fight transferred from the jungles and the fields and the central highlands of Vietnam to the Halls of this Congress. I remember when liberal Democrats were on this floor saying that Johnson, and then Nixon, did not have the constitutional power to absorb 300 and 400 killed in action every week.

□ 1800

Every time I thought they are half right, I was suppressed by loyal Americans saying you must support the men in the field. The last speaker talked about the enthusiasm of our young men and now women who want to do the job they were trained to do.

How many people are left in this House who talked to the 18,000 Vietnamese-speaking Green Berets who John F. Kennedy sent to Vietnam in 1963, 1964 and 1965? They were over there because of his orders in 1961 and 1962. How many thought that they should be allowed to do the job then? Talk to some of the fighter pilots here like the gentleman from California, DUKE CUNNINGHAM, the gentleman from Texas SAM JOHNSON, and the gentleman from Florida, PETE PETERSON, on this side. Ask how they were not allowed to hit serious targets in Vietnam and paid for it with years out of their life and their friends dead.

This is going to be, as the man in the Speaker's chair said today, at the Republican conference the most important vote of 1995, maybe 1995-1996. Clinton does not have the constitutional authority to do this. We have not even properly debated the constitutionality of it, let alone the weather report that I am looking at at Tuzla, which is sickening to put our men in there. Ninety-seven people are on the ground only right now.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], distinguished dean of the Florida delegation.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I have learned a few things in life. One of the things that sticks out I guess in all of our minds is that anything that is worth doing is not without risk, and certainly this mission is not without risk, but after long consideration, I rise to support the Hamilton resolution, support the mission and support the troops that are involved.

I was here on the House floor and voted for the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. This is not a Gulf of Tonkin resolution. The Gulf of Tonkin resolution was a thinly disguised declaration of war against the Vietnamese forces. We go this time to keep peace, not to make war. There is a plan. There is a large support from the nations of the world to support this plan. There is acquiescence by the leaders of the combatants involved. Nothing that we do is without risk. We are going to have some casualties, for which we will all feel very sorry. But we cannot sit here or stand here idly and not do anything. Too much is at stake.

I often think that World War II could have been avoided had there just been any resolve on the organized world community to resist the aggression that took place in the guise of Hitler and Mussolini and Tojo. In the beginning, we could have said no, if we had had the physical ability or the will to do it, but we did not and the world did not. That conflagration, that combat grew and grew and grew.

I do not know that what we are doing here today is similar, but if we fail to act, the fault will be on our part. There is a time in which civilized people must act and must act together and must act in accordance with a plan. This is the best plan that we have come up with. I think it is time that we go ahead with it, facing the risk of facing the challenges that are there and be resolved to support our troops and to take whatever action is necessary in bringing about peace in that area of the world. If we do not, the fault will be on us. If we do, there will be plenty of other people to help claim whatever victory there is in all of this. But we must move. We must move together and we must move resolutely. Let us support our armed forces.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN].

(Mr. BATEMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, like the gentleman from Tennessee, I was terribly moved yesterday as Prime Minister Peres extolled the United States of America for what it means to the entire world community. We all stood and applauded the eloquence, even though maybe that was self-serving, because he was talking about us.

This country, after having deferred to our European allies for 1991 until into this year, finally became fully engaged. Because it became engaged, our NATO Forces commenced their strikes against the Bosnian Serbs.

Following that, there was a cease-fire and, following that, an agreement that the leaders of the warring factions would come to this country to try and work out a negotiated peace. None of that would have happened but for American leadership. There is no substitute for American leadership.

Having brought about a cease-fire, now having brought about an agreement under our sponsorship, based upon a commitment that our forces would be committed, we make a terrible error if we now renege on that commitment. There are things about the commitment, the degree of the commitment and blemishes in the commitment that I think are unfortunate. But the bedrock of the matter is that we stand committed. If we renege upon it, our vital national security interests will be very materially and significantly adversely affected.

We are the sole remaining world power, and we cannot be engaged militarily certainly anywhere and everywhere where there is strife in this world. But certainly if, having given this commitment, we renege upon it, say goodbye to the NATO alliance. Others may tell you otherwise, but I have no doubt that what it will, cripple it. Say goodbye to America playing a role and being credible in all of the far-flung corners of the globe, where the United States can make a difference in terms of promoting stability and peace, which are in our national security interests.

I must oppose the Dornan resolution.

There is not and has not been a substantial question as to whether America has a role to play in seeking a peaceful conclusion to the war in Bosnia. It is an immutable fact of history that our country is the world's premier superpower. We did not seek that role; it has devolved upon us as a by-product of history in this century.

The international activism of President Theodore Roosevelt, followed by our being compelled to enter World War I to facilitate the triumph over the forces of aggression and totalitarianism, had consequences. We were right recognized as a major world power.

Unfortunately, after World War I, we withdrew from the world stage. We refused to participate in the League of Nations despite the fact that it was our creation. We stood by and watched Fascism come to power in Italy and Germany. We offered no meaningful opposition to Hitler as he marched into the Rhineland or to Mussolini as he attacked Ethiopia and marched into Croatia. We offered no resistance to Hitler's dismemberment of Czechoslovakia or to the invasion of Poland, which ultimately led England and France to belatedly challenge Nazi Germany after it had rearmé.

Only after the treacherous attack on Pearl Harbor did we enter World War II and again make possible the defeat of aggressive and repressive totalitarianism. Based on the disastrous agreement struck with Stalin at Yalta, we saw all the Balkan, Eastern Europe and Baltic states come under the yoke of communism and an iron curtain descend across Europe. We committed ourselves to helping Greece and Turkey from falling prey to communism. We initiated the Marshall Plan to save Western Europe from sinking into economic collapse and communist influence. We negotiated the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] as a bulwark against the expansion of the Soviet Union. In 1950, we led a United Nations' effort to defeat the conquest of South Korea by the North Korean communists.

It could be argued that we could—or should—have remained disengaged from

these situations because they were not our problems. Fortunately, we did not. Soviet influence was contained after a struggle of more than 40 years. We led the free world in defeating Soviet imperial designs and the nations of Eastern Europe were freed of Communist regimes accountable to Moscow. This is an incredible record; one every American should reflect on with pride.

There is no disputing that the historic events of this century have conferred upon the United States a status that is significant and unavoidable. We are the superpower, what our country thinks, the position it takes, and how it acts are vitally important factors in every area of the globe. Only a fully engaged United States could have put together the grand coalition that defeated Iraq in the Gulf War, when Sadaam Hussein's aggression threatened our security interests. No one can conclude that this aggression would have been resolved without American leadership.

The break-up of powerful empires has throughout history been attended by political and economic instability, which is anathema to democratic governments and inimical to the maintenance of peace. Surely, few would argue that we have no interest in encouraging democracy and peace. The absence of either runs counter to our moral view and, as history has shown in certain areas—as in Europe—contrary to our national security interest.

None of this argues that we are the world's policeman, or should conduct ourself as an international busybody. We should, however, be engaged where our influence serves a constructive purpose in spreading or supporting democracy, even if no American military or economic commitment is contemplated or appropriate. Against this background, I approach the question of what is the role of this country in the Balkans and in seeking to end the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Due to the troubled history of this region through the centuries, and the nature of the ethnic, religious, and nationalistic forces at play there, the peace of Europe has not only been threatened but conflict has occurred.

When the former Yugoslavia broke up in 1991, the United States remained largely detached and chose to defer to its European allies to deal with the problem. This was an understandable view, but events have proven it unrealistic. Without the United States taking an active part, there exists a deficiency in leadership adequate to bring about an end to the war in Bosnia and to discourage its spread. NATO allies deployed thousands of troops on the ground and sustained a number of casualties, but the troops and their diplomacy failed to produce a comprehensive peace agreement.

With Americans successfully insisting upon NATO air strikes against the Bosnia Serbs, and Croatian-Bosnian Moslem successes, the warring parties were induced by U.S. diplomacy to come to the bargaining table. But for the stature of the United States, this would not have happened, and vital to it happening was a commitment that the United States would play a part in the peacekeeping forces that would be put in place following the signing of a peace agreement. That such an agreement has been concluded is a triumph of American diplomacy and a tribute to this country's standing as a force for good, for peace and for democracy. How can we bring the parties to the bargaining table based on a commitment of

our involvement, induce them to agree to peace, and then walk away from that commitment?

If we refuse to honor the commitment, it will have consequences. These consequences would be significant and would affect our vital national security interest. If we falter, it would have deleterious implications for our most important national security relationship: the NATO alliance. It would be a low blow from which the alliance could likely never recover. That presents a clear and vital national security concern for this country.

Should we shrink from our proper role in implementing the peace agreement negotiated under and as a result of our sponsorship, this country will have lost not face, but credibility throughout the world. It would have an impact in this hemisphere, throughout Europe, Asia and the Middle East—in short, everywhere. A superpower sought as a force for stability and peace that chooses to disengage, especially when it made a commitment to be involved, defaults as a leader. Such a default creates a vacuum of power no other nation is capable of filling. Such a circumstance is the basis from which instability and conflict are born and this defeats our vital national interests.

We have supported expansion of NATO over the reluctance of some of our NATO allies. If we refuse to lead in implementing the peace agreement we procured our policy of expanding NATO will be nullified. NATO could well contract, not expand. Resumption of the conflict between Bosnian Serbs, Bosnian Muslims and Croats will not necessarily lead to expansion of conflicts throughout the Balkans, but if it resumes because the United States refuses to play its proper role, the risk of new and wider conflict in the Balkans increases. A signal that we are not concerned and are unwilling to take some risk for peace is a signal that we would not regard conflict between Albanian, Macedonian, Bulgarian, Greek, or Turkish ethnic, religious, or nationalistic elements as adversely affecting our national interest. To send such a signal would be a tragic mistake, for there are those who would certainly receive that signal and become more inclined to act upon it.

I repeat, the issue should not be whether there is an important role we need and should play in bringing peace to Bosnia and Herzegovina. We do, we should, we must play our proper role. President Clinton deserves recognition for ultimately becoming engaged and for using our unique standing to bring the warring parties to the negotiating table. He was right to do so. In fact, it should have been done earlier. President Clinton was correct to signal that, if a peace agreement was reached, we would play a role in seeing it implemented.

To have specified a commitment of 20,000 to 25,000 American ground forces, even before the military mission and the size of the total force could be determined, however, was a ridiculous mistake. We will undoubtedly have a very heavy responsibility for the air and sea-lift for the peace implementation force. We will provide the medical care, command and control, most of the intelligence function and the combat air support. This being the case, there should have been no need for us to comprise a third or more of the ground forces. This is a disproportionate burden for us, measured by what our NATO and other allies can and should be expected to do. The President

should be seeking to reduce the burden we accepted to a more equitable level.

American and the other forces deployed to implement the peace agreement must be perceived and in fact be neutral, not protagonists of one or the other of the warring parties. To be viewed as favoring one side risks the permanence of the peace and enhances the risk of casualties for the American forces.

There are provisions of the Dayton peace agreement that wisely impose a moratorium for a period of months on the acquisition of arms by the formerly warring parties. It properly calls for negotiation of a disarmament regime to bring the conflicting parties to a state of parity in aggregate military capability, which should serve to deter renewal of the conflict. This is eminently sound, and we must exert intense diplomatic influences to promote military parity through disarmament. If the effort succeeds, there would be no need for us to arm and train the Muslims unless it was done within the framework of such an agreement. If the disarmament effort does not succeed, the Dayton agreement, by its terms, provides that after 180 days there should be an agreed self-executing military parity between the parties using as a baseline the military resources of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Based on the terms of the agreement, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia would be permitted 75 percent of the baseline, with the Republic of Croatia and the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina each allocated 30 percent of the baseline.

If we make it clear that we will not provide arms to any faction except under the specific condition that it is done to provide and protect the military parity to which the parties have agreed, we can preserve the mutual, even-handed posture our role as a peacekeeper requires. The earlier the President spells it out, the less likely any role we ultimately undertake to arm and train Muslim forces will be perceived as constituting a hostile presence by the other parties.

Our NATO allies have opposed arming the Bosnian Muslims. Should the United States proceed to do so while there is an ongoing NATO deployment, and without the concurrence of the North Atlantic Council, it would threaten alliance solidarity. This would place us on a slippery slope we would do well to avoid. If we do as I suggest it should be acceptable to our NATO allies because our actions would be consistent with the Dayton agreement that they have endorsed.

I oppose any American forces being deployed to implement the peace agreement negotiated in Dayton until or unless it has been formally accepted by all the parties. Our role is not to make peace when the parties wish to continue the conflict. Our mission is to implement and help build mutual confidence among former warring factions who purport to want and have agreed to peace. If those parties by their conduct cast doubt upon whether they indeed desire the peace they ask us to implement, we should not put our forces in harm's way.

The agreement initiated in Dayton spells out a number of specific measures the warring parties pledged to implement within a specified period of time. Those measures include the departure of foreign forces such as the Islamic fundamentalists, whose presence is a threat to NATO troops. The warring parties also agreed to comply with the October 5,

1995, ceasefire and to refrain from all offensive operations of any kind, to disarm and disband all armed civilian groups and to avoid committing reprisals or counterattacks in response to violations of the agreement. The parties committed to begin promptly and proceed steadily to withdraw all forces behind a zone of separation. The parties are to account for all prisoners and to release them no later than 30 days after the date of the "transfer of authority," which is the date on which the U.N. commander transfers authority to the Implementation Force [I-FOR] commander.

The I-FOR implementation of the military aspects of the agreement should be delayed until the warring parties have demonstrated their willingness to discharge the obligations spelled out in Dayton by their leaders. If this is not done it will signify that they do not accept and will not comply with the reasonable measures required of them. In that event there will be no peace to implement and I-FOR, from the outset, would be injected into a combat mission.

The Clinton administration is insisting that our deployment of forces in Bosnia will last approximately 1 year. That is not an exit strategy, only a more or less arbitrary date. I am sympathetic to the declaration of a date for the withdrawal of American military forces from Bosnia, and it should be understood that if the need exists for a continued deployment beyond 1 year that the forces that remain will be comprised from contingents supplied from other nations. While establishment of fixed dates to conclude operations is generally ill-advised, a 1-year deadline for participation of American forces should be sufficient to ensure that the conditions in Bosnia are stabilized to the extent that any continued deployment could be sustained by non-United States forces.

As I have said, we do have a role to play in bringing peace to Bosnia. In 1 year we will have fairly and fully played that role and will have created conditions where non-U.S. forces should be fully adequate. The President should immediately communicate this position to our allies.

Our commitment of ground forces is based upon more than the initialing of words on a piece of paper. It is predicated upon the premise that the warring parties truly desire peace and will comply with the actions they have pledged to take. If they do not, the conditions for our commitment of forces will not have been met and U.S. personnel should not be deployed. In this context, the recent repudiation of the Dayton agreement by Bosnian Serb military leaders and the statements of French Gen. Jean-Rene Bachelet are particularly worrisome. Before we proceed with the deployment of our personnel, we should insist on assurances through confidence-building measures that the Bosnian Serbs want peace and under the terms of the Dayton agreement.

The securing of peace in Bosnia and stability in the Balkans is a noble objective that serves American interests and justifies our accepting some measured risk of casualties. Every drop of blood of American military personnel is precious, yet to shrink from our forces being engaged because there might be some casualties argues for doing away with our military. An American policy that shrinks from honoring commitments because there might be casualties is an invitation to future disaster. Our national interests throughout the

globe would be imperiled if we prove unwilling to honor a major commitment.

If we are steadfast, we reinforce freedom, decency and stability throughout the world. To be otherwise would lead to instability and upheaval in many areas that are important to our Nation's peace and security.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut, [Ms. DELAURO] with whom I visited Bosnia this past weekend.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of American troops and in support of the United States mission in Bosnia.

The debate we have here today is as much about America's future as it is about Bosnia. Our vote today will send a message about our country's future role in NATO. If we walk away today, we will have relinquished our leadership role in the international community.

The human tragedy in Bosnia is beyond description. A quarter of a million people have been killed in 3 years of senseless slaughter. If we fail to enforce the Dayton peace agreement, we turn our backs on those who have suffered from mass rape, ethnic cleansing, and other unspeakable horrors.

In the face of this moral crisis, we must be willing to step forward and lead. It is what great nations such as ours have always done. Moral leadership in the world is part of the price of being the world's sole superpower.

Over the weekend, I joined a factfinding trip to Bosnia. I admit that I went with strong reservations about our military mission there, but I have returned with the knowledge that our troops are ready and our mission is clear. I have also returned with a belief that we have a moral obligation to do what only a U.S.-led force can do: keep the peace.

One of the highlights of our trip was a stopover in Germany to visit with American troops who will be deployed in the coming weeks. While there, I had a chance to speak with a young soldier from New London, CT, Private Jarion Clarke. Private Clark told me that he is well-trained, has faith in his leaders, and believes in the United States mission in Bosnia.

I asked Private Clarke what I could do for him: "Tell the American people that we are ready and we need their support," he said. So, that is the message I bring. Our soldiers need our support. They deserve our support.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Dornan, and Buyer resolution. Vote for the Hamilton resolution. The only measure that clearly says to American men and women in uniform is that we stand behind them.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GANSKE].

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I too, just returned from Bosnia. Let me summarize what I learned.

First, no one in the Balkans wants to be part of a minority. Minorities get

raped and killed. This fact caused the refugee problem. My impression is that there is a difference in commitment by the signers of the treaty on how to handle these refugees. One party wants them to return to their homes and villages. The other argues that this will recreate the conditions that led to the conflict in the first place. They argue for humanitarian aid to resettle these refugees in safer places. This is a crucial difference that bears on the long-term chances for success and peace.

Second, there is clearly unhappiness with the territorial provisions of the accord by both the Bosnians and the Serbs. The Bosnian Serbs feel they were betrayed, and the Bosnian Moslems do not like the territorial provisions either. They only signed on with the condition that the United States arm and train them.

This brings us to the third major area of disagreement, the level of rearming of the Bosnian Serbs. There were reports in the press indicating that the Bosnian Moslems want training for 18 brigades and want to be supplied with 200 tanks and 200 armed vehicles. Mr. Milosevic on the other hand thinks that all parties should proportionally downsize. This difference of interpretation of the treaty does not bode well for long-term peace.

Mr. Speaker, the technical requirements of the plan are contradictory. Will our troops be policemen or not? Nation builders or not? I asked a senior military official what would happen if in his sector the Bosnians or the Serbs started to harass a civilian population, would he respond or not. He said, why yes. Well, if he does, then he has now taken sides. We now have the U.S. military in a civil war.

Mr. Speaker, there is an alternative. Lift the arms embargo, provide relief aid, provide the same air support, the same logistical support. It is not too late. The best answer is Dornan.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this past weekend I was fortunate to lead, with Congressman DENNIS HASTERT of Illinois, a CODEL which visited Italy, Croatia, Bosnia, Serbia, and Germany. We met with the President of Croatia, the Prime Minister of Bosnia, the President of Serbia, IFOR commanders, and U.S. troops who were preparing for deployment. The CODEL sought to answer six questions: What is the United States stake in Bosnia? Can the IFOR mission be accomplished? Are there risks to our troops? How do you separate military from civilian responsibilities? How do you measure the success of the missions, and what happens if they are not working? What should be done to maximize IFOR's success?

Adm. Leighton Smith, commander of the American forces south, and the other American generals and officers who briefed the CODEL were confident that the IFOR mission is achievable because IFOR has a clear mandate, substantial firepower, and the desire of the

parties involved to settle this conflict. Each head of government with whom we met also expressed confidence that the Dayton signatories would meet their obligations because, as President Tudjman said, "Without the direct involvement of the United States, peace in Bosnia is not possible."

Implementation of the Dayton agreement is necessary and only the United States and NATO can do it.

There are risks. The roads are poor and the danger of accidents is high. Snipers, car bombs, land mines, and mortar fire are all potential threats. The presence of an unknown number of Mujahedeen fighters may be a problem, especially if they decide they do not want to leave Bosnia.

Clearly, there are many unknowns. Neither the U.S. Congress, our military leaders, our NATO allies, or the signatories to the Dayton agreement can promise that our involvement is without risk. But we do know that the Dayton signatories, both the politicians and the people they represent said they want peace. And they believe that peace and stability can be reached only with our assistance. As Prime Minister Silajdzic of Bosnia said, "This move by your President is a courageous move, a far-reaching move. It is extremely important to grasp this change for peace. Because if Dayton doesn't work nothing will work. We cannot have peace without a stable buffer, a bridge. That is why we need NATO troops. No other organization can do it. We need your help to make peace, not war."

Mr. Speaker, this debate is as much about our role in the world as it is about our role in this conflict. Today we are deciding how involved we want to be in shaping the world around us. In the past 72 hours two persons have put our role into perspective for me. The first was Admiral Smith. When asked about the United States national interest in Bosnia, he replied that the wrong questions was being posed. He stated: "The question is about U.S. leadership in the world. If we don't go in our credibility goes to rock bottom. The next time when vital U.S. interests are engaged, are our allies and friends going to be with us? Probably not."

The second person was Israeli Prime Minister Shimon Peres, during his address to the joint session of Congress, when he said that the United States has "... save[d] the globe from three of its greatest menaces: nazi tyranny, Japanese militarism and the communist challenge." When he spoke of Palestinian democracy and peace with Israel's enemies, he said "three years ago such a prospect would have been a fantasy. All of this would not be attainable were it not for the American involvement and support for our efforts."

Mr. Speaker, every person voting in this Chamber today must decide right now what kind of world he or she wants to live in. We are clearly the most powerful country in the world. We have a strong military, a stable government,

robust civil rights, and a reputation for constantly recreating ourselves to make America a better, more equitable country. And it is because of our vibrant, democratic traditions that the rest of the world looks to us for leadership. We talk a good game in this body, passing resolutions to say this and sense of Congress' to say that, but if we do not support our good intentions with actions, then our words will lose meaning and our good intentions and strong words will be a joke worldwide.

I, for one, believe in American leadership and I believe, as one of the American generals said to me, that the people of Bosnia, Serbia, and Croatia, need a period of decency. I want to give them that period of decency by helping to secure their peace.

□ 1815

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], chairman of our Committee on Appropriations.

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I also was in Bosnia last weekend, and I met some of the troops that are going to carry out this plan. I had my picture taken with them, and I got a medal from them, from the First Armored Division. They are good people, and they deserve our support.

They were sent by the President to work with NATO to separate warring parties and hopefully keep those people from killing one another.

Now those parties have gone to Dayton, and they have signed a peace accord, and that accord says that our troops are there to assure the peace, not to make war, not to rebuild Bosnia, not to aid refugees, not to remove mines, not to disarm the parties, not to arm or train the Muslims. They are there to keep the peace, and they are well-trained, and well-equipped. They are prepared for the mission, and they will shoot to defend themselves, if necessary.

But hopefully they will not have to.

Now, I have opposed the circumstances which have brought us to this point. I cannot change history however. The Commander in Chief of our armed forces has deployed our troops in what he says is in our national interest, and at this point I can only repeat what the local commander of our forces told me as recently as this Monday. He said, "Don't let the Congress do anything which sends a message to these kids that you in Congress aren't in full support of their efforts." Mr. Speaker, I intend to follow his advice, and I intend to support our troops in and out of Bosnia.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote for the buyer resolution, I will vote for the Hamilton resolution, and I will give our troops the resources that they need to do their job and come home.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to another

Floridian, Mr. PETERSON, a distinguished veteran who, I might add, had a very significant hand in allowing that the fighter pilots from France were released.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we have a peace treaty. We did not sign it, we did not initial it, but the combatants in the war in Bosnia, all three, did.

This is an unusual opportunity for America. We have always had the opportunity to risk war, and we have done so every time that there was any national interest at stake. We have done that willingly, we have done that as a governmental body, we have done that as a nation.

What a wonderful opportunity to have today. We can risk peace. Yes, we can risk peace.

What happens if we fail? What happens if we fail in our effort to seek peace? We have war.

This is a no-brainer to me. Never have I in my career had the opportunity to go for peace. Our troops are going to Bosnia to implement a peaceful settlement that all three of the combatants have agreed to.

No one, I do not think can say that anything that happens in Europe is not of interest to us. The cost of being a superpower is that virtually anything that happens on this planet affects this Nation, and what is happening in Bosnia and in the Balkans right now is in fact affecting this Nation, and it will affect it even more if we do nothing. We have a very shallow window of opportunity to grab peace, and we should grab it with both hands, wrap our arms around it, and take it to the Balkans.

If we fail to do so, my colleagues, there is no doubt in my mind, having just visited that area, that we will have an expansion of this war to Kosovo, which will then trigger the Albanian input, which will then probably bring Macedonia in, which will then bring in Turkey, which will then bring in Greece, and then what do we have? We have the potential for World War III.

Mr. Speaker, we have history behind us that takes us back to World War I and World War II, both of which began in the Balkans. Do not let us help that start World War III. Support our troops and support the policy.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute, 30 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO], a member of our Committee on International Relations.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I would encourage the Members of Congress to examine the exact document which is called the peace agreement, especially the military annex which is attached to it, and to compare the rules of engagement there with the statement put out by the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States, and those rules of engagement contradict each other. In the one put out by the Joint Chiefs of Staff it says we are not to be involved in moving any people or



equipment out of the demilitarized zone, we are not to be involved in any type of disarmament, and yet the NATO troops, in the military annex attached the peace agreement, gives our troops that type of power.

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of defining the mission to send our beloved troops to a country that has experienced war for 1,500 years. I support the troops. I do not believe it is wise to send them, but I support the troops.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. BUNN].

Mr. BUNN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, having just returned from Bosnia, I was appalled at the devastation in Sarajevo. I did not see a single building that had not been damaged by the shelling of the sniper fire, and it is very, very clear that something has to be done, but I came back convinced that the President had made a horrible mistake in the decision to send our troops there.

We had an opportunity to listen to our military commanders tell us about how the troops are going to get in and how we are going to deal with the planning for casualties, how we have planned for communications, but when we asked about the exit strategy, there was no plan. We do not have a plan, how we are going to get our troops out of there. There was an alternative, and the plan was to lift the arms embargo and allow the Bosnians to defend themselves, and in meetings with the leaders in Bosnia the vice-president of Bosnia said point blank, "We didn't ask for your troops, we didn't need your troops. What we needed was the ability to defend ourselves, and you denied us that."

Nevertheless we need to understand today that there are troops there and troops on the way. Nothing we do tonight is going to stop the deployment. We are beyond that now. Congress is often faced with bad options, and President Clinton has given us bad options, but tonight we can choose to support the troops.

I am going to vote no on Dornan and support the alternative so we can do everything possible to allow our troops who are well trained and well equipped to do a job that they should not have been asked to do.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. INGLIS].

□ 1830

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from yielding time to me.

There has been a fair amount of confusion on the floor here today about the thought process. One idea is we should support the troops by sending them there. The best way to support the troops is to keep them from going there.

Then there was a statement about how we are there to wage peace. I have never seen it waged with tanks and guns and bullets. I think if you are going to wage peace, you do not send in the U.S. Army. The U.S. Army goes into places to crush, kill, and destroy. That is what they are real good at. I do not understand this idea of waging peace with tanks and weapons. If there is a peace, there is no need for peacekeepers. They have peace. If there is not a peace, then our people are peace-makers and that makes them, I think, combatants in a centuries-old civil war.

Then there is the thought we have to contain the conflict. It is like world War II, we are told. Think again. World War II, two key differences: No. 1, a pernicious, expansionistic ideology that wanted to control the world. There is no pernicious, expansionistic ideology here. This is the normal inhumanity of man against man, normal hatred. It is around the globe. It is in Rwanda, it is in China, it is all over. No pernicious expansionistic ideology.

The second key difference between World War II and now, in World War II we were not prepared. Now we are prepared. We learned after World War II you prepare for peace by preparing for war, and you stand ready with that strength under control. We can contain the conflict no matter where it goes in that region.

The sober judgment we need to bring right now is very simple: Is there an American security interest at risk? I would submit, that is the threshold question before you send troops anywhere: Is there an American security interest at risk? Clearly there is not in the Balkans. The only way to send that message is to support the gentleman's alternative.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

(Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, for me the most important priority is to support our servicemen and women. The President has made his decision. While I am angry that he has made it without consultation to Congress and with the American people, we need to back up our troops 100 percent. Our actions tonight should send this message loudly and clearly to them as they prepare to go, because 25 years ago I was one of them in Vietnam. I was sent on a mission that bitterly divided this country and this House, but I learned then, as I know now, that our troops deserve nothing less than the undivided support of this House and all the resources necessary to support their mission. Please support the Buyer resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, in 1954 one of my heroes, Senator John Stennis, spoke against sending American mechanics to a little country called South Vietnam. He said that we would get drawn into a land war that we could not win, in a part of the world that people did not care about. John C. Stennis was right. We did get sucked into it. Then when that happened, he did his constitutional duty to support those troops.

What I am asking this body to do tonight is to prevent us from getting sucked into another war where other brave young Americans will die, be maimed, in a part of the world that Americans just do not care about. It is not a right or wrong decision, it is what is best for the American young men and women who have sworn to defend this country.

The best thing for those fine young people is not to waste their lives, and above all, do not abuse their trust. They swore to defend the Constitution of this country. They swore to defend this country. We are not even a participant on this treaty. Vote for the Dornan alternative.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of our time to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], the ranking member of the Committee on National Security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky). The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] is recognized for 4¼ minutes.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, we come to the end of the general debate on this very significant and important issue. All of us in this room come to this debate from our various reference points. My reference point in this debate is as a peace advocate who came here 25 years ago to challenge militarism and to challenge the concept of military intervention. We opposed the war in Vietnam, military intervention in El Salvador, Nicaragua, Grenada, opposed our military intervention in the Persian Gulf.

We now find ourselves in the throes of a new era, an era referred to as the post-cold-war era, a period marked with change, with transition, a period pregnant with challenges and with opportunities.

But I would hasten to observe, Mr. Speaker, that there is a very interesting and fascinating disconnect in this country at this moment. At the grass roots level, the bedrock of a democracy, the American people look to Washington to say, "What do we do, leaders, in this new post-cold-war era?" The leaders in Washington, us being politicians who tend to poll, measure, count the votes, weight the mail and count the telephone calls, are saying, "No, you tell us," so there is a great disconnect. Most politicians are not willing to step into a period of transition to lead. That is risky. Many American people are saying in this period of



transition, "Tell us where to go." It is very difficult.

I am prepared to accept the challenge. I step into this breach. My argument, Mr. Speaker, is that yes, this is a period of change and transition, challenge and opportunity; perhaps wrongly, but I believe that this post-cold-war era has presented us with a significant enemy, and that enemy is war itself, war itself. The great challenge is the challenge of peace. The great opportunity is to bring the world, kicking and screaming, to peace.

Perhaps wrongly, Mr. Speaker, but I believe that in my entire adult lifetime we have been given a magnificent gift, the gift of the post-cold-war world, an opportunity to step forward boldly and bring about significant change in America and in the world. I believe that this is the first opportunity, Mr. Speaker, that we truly have to challenge the whole notion of the use of force and the making of war as an instrument of foreign policy, the first time; the first time we truly, as adults, can challenge these whole bizarre and barbaric ideas of using force to kill and maim and harm, and using war as an instrument of foreign policy.

I have lived long enough, Mr. Speaker, to come to this moment where we now truly have an opportunity to talk about the issue of peace. The transition that we are in, the pain that we feel, I believe is that we are witnessing the transition from war to peace, from warring to peacekeeping, from risking war to risking peace. These painful steps into the future, into the unknown, into transition, into change, are fraught with challenges. They are difficult.

Peacekeeping is a new concept, a new lexicon, not worn easily by politicians, not understood by the American people. It is not something we have done, but I believe that it is something that we need to do as we move into the post-cold-war world with respect to Bosnia. The moral imperative is as follows: If you encourage a group of people to come off the bloody battlefield of killing and maiming and raping and plundering, and move them to the negotiating table, and they come with a product, perfect or imperfect, good or bad, liked or disliked, a product, a peace plan, and then they say to you, "He has murdered my son, I murdered his daughter, he murdered my mother, I murdered his father, we murdered 16,000 of our children and 250,000 of our neighbors. So while we have come to a peace plan, we do not rest easy with each other. We are paranoid about each other. We are fearful about each other. So stand in the way for a while to allow a period of transition as we move from the bloody battlefield to the issue of peace; so help us at this moment, because we are fearful. We have killed many of them."

The moral question then is do you reject that notion? What is a peace advocate in a post-cold-war world? Do we walk away from that?

Finally, Mr. Speaker, when 6 million Jews were being killed during the period of Nazi Germany, as we looked back at that moment we said, "How could that have occurred? Killing 6 million people is terrible." But there are 250,000 people dying in Bosnia. So what triggers your moral imperative? Six million people? Two hundred fifty thousand people? Where do you get upset?

Mr. Speaker, I would conclude by saying I think our role is one of peace. I think we have a responsibility to walk into this period as peacekeepers. I think we must address the moral imperative to play our significant role in the world. I think we ought to reject any effort to do anything less than that.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT].

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I also went to Bosnia to meet our troops on the way in Germany and to receive a coin from the First Armored Division. This coin I plan to carry for the next 12 months, so I keep them in my thoughts and prayers. But this is a civil war. This is not a religious war. Only three of the five parties have initialed off this peace agreement.

Today, Bosnian Croats who did not initial this agreement are burning Bosnian Herzegovinian villages. This week they released a known war criminal. Bosnian Serbs, who also did not sign this peace agreement or initial this peace agreement, have two war criminals still commanding troops. This is an incomplete agreement. There will be no peace without justice. These people must be brought to justice.

This is just a trial separation before the divorce. We are giving them the opportunity to rest and rearm. We need to create other opportunities for peace, opportunities that will be there without sacrificing our young men and women. That is why I support the Dornan bill.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH].

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I am truly amazed at how the sides change here. Many of the same people who have been telling us for 20 years that we can no longer be the world's policeman are now coming to the floor saying, "We must be the world's policeman," even when there is not a direct vital American interest worth dying for. Who said that? The Secretary of Defense, Secretary Perry, in Philadelphia, said there was not a direct vital American interest involved. So do we as a Congress have a right to stand up and say something? Yes. That is our constitutional right. Yet it amazes me that Republicans as well as Democrats say it is all the President's prerogative.

James Madison, the framer of the Constitution, in 1792 wrote to Thomas Jefferson and said the following:

The Constitution supposes what the history of all governments demonstrate: that the executive is the branch of power most interested in war and most prone to it. It has, accordingly, with studied care, vested the question of war in the legislature.

It is our responsibility. Support Dornan and support the troops.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield the remainder of our time to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] is recognized for 3¼ minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this is a very difficult subject for me to even speak about. It is wrapped with emotion, it is wrapped with anger, and it is wrapped with pain. I do not think, no matter what you vote for today, if you vote for the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], I am against sending the troops to Bosnia. I think if you vote for the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], that is a message, again, that you do not want to do that. The Senate is not going to pick it up. I think that is an acceptable vote.

If you vote for the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] to support our troops in what they are doing, I think that is acceptable, also, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] as well. I am not concerned so much about the vote today, Mr. Speaker, as I am in the future.

Many of us served overseas. In 1968, President Johnson stopped the bombing over in North Vietnam. Our hands were tied.

□ 1845

I watched friends of mine die. They did not have to die. We had Mogia and Van Kari and Ban Nappi Pass where we could see supplies coming through, and we could not stop them.

There was an ROE that you had to wait until a MiG shot at you first before you could shoot back. No Member of Congress ever devised that ROE. They never strapped their rear end into a fighter.

I looked at the thousands of my friends that died over there when we could not hit the SAM sites and we could not mine the harbors. Yet when President Nixon came up, he let us do that.

My concern is in the future because there are going to be some tough votes. There are a lot of people here in this body that will do anything they can to cut defense. It is a legitimate issue. They would rather put it in social spending. But in the future, we are going to have to vote, ladies and gentlemen, on supporting our troops. Make sure that you do.

Another area that kills me, not just under this President. Lebanon was a disaster, to tie down our Marines.

Those kids died and they did not have to die. In Somalia, we have gone through the reasons why our troopers died. It is because we did not give them the support, the votes in this Congress and the President. Not just this President but other Presidents.

My real concern, Mr. Speaker, is the future. Because the votes are going to be tough. You are going to have to increase defense dollars probably if we get tied in there. I would ask my colleagues that want to cut defense, that want to cut defense, think about the amendments and the bills that you are going to vote for and all of them, because what you are saying is that you are going to support these kids. It is important. Do not forget the way you vote today.

Most of us have lost too many friends. There are 30 kids that fought in Vietnam and in Desert Storm that because of Tailhook are not passing and making Captain or Commander because there are certain people that would exacerbate that. Some of these kids had nothing to do with Tailhook. But yet the Senate failed to confirm them.

I would ask you, when we ask our men and our women to place their lives on the line, do not forget those sacrifices. Because we have over and over and over again, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask, think about your vote but carry it on after today.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my opposition to the deployment of United States troops to the former Yugoslavia.

I have consistently voted to lift the arms embargo levied on the Bosnian Moslems. I firmly believe that President Bush and President Clinton were wrong in their policy to continue the arms embargo on Bosnia. The Bosnians have the right, as a sovereign people, to defend themselves against any form of aggression. By continuing the arms embargo, the United States and its allies have perpetuated the slaughter of innocent people.

I applaud the Dayton peace agreement initiated by the warring factions and the agreement to begin to re-arm the Bosnian Moslems in an attempt to return a balance of power to the region. However, I am skeptical of the agreement because all parties have not initiated the agreement and I have viewed very vocal and extremely aggressive anti-American sentiments in Bosnia. The peace is tenuous at best.

I have long questioned the role of the United States as the policeman of the world. Clearly there are other conflicts around the world that need policing, yet, no one has called for the use of the United States military. Not one Member of Congress has claimed that these conflicts are in the national interest of the United States or worth one drop of American blood. Still, Members call for American troops to sacrifice for the Bosnian civil war.

During the debate surrounding the deployment of United States troops to the Persian Gulf, many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle derided the deployment as the United States in the role of world policeman. These same Members are now supporting the

deployment of troops to Bosnia because they claim that it is the duty of the United States to lead the world in policing the civil war.

Let me simply suggest to those Members: this is not the Persian Gulf. The United States deployed troops to the Persian Gulf as a direct result of military aggression by Iraq against Kuwait. The Bosnian deployment is a result of a weak peace agreement between warring factions of a centuries-old civil war that represents no risk to United States national security.

I do not support the deployment of troops to Bosnia because the President has not convinced me, my constituents, or the majority of Americans of the need for this military action. Yes, I recognize the authority of the President to commit troops, but I also recognize the authority of the U.S. Congress to authorize the use of the military. The President, after repeated requests by this body, has neglected to seek Congressional authorization for the deployment of the troops. For this reason I supported Mr. DORNAN's bill to refuse to fund the military action in Bosnia.

The President has truly failed in his attempt to convince the American people that one American life is worth peace in Bosnia. My constituency is not convinced. Overwhelmingly, my constituents have written to me to oppose the deployment of troops to Bosnia. I will not allow this Nation to become the policeman for a regional civil war that has raged for hundreds of years and still simmers below the surface of this peace agreement.

I have supported the use of United States technical support and related assistance in the Bosnian theater. I did not oppose the use of United States airpower to protect the peacekeepers in Bosnia because this is where the United States expertise lies. As the world leader in military technology, this is an acceptable role for the United States. However, I will not support the use of United States ground forces in the Bosnian theater. Ground support in the Balkans is the sole responsibility of the European nations. Europe has the singular obligation to protect the European continent and provide the force necessary to maintain peace in the European theater.

Due to the lack of a cohesive mission strategy and the inability of the President to convince the majority of the American people that deployment of United States troops to Bosnia is essential, I cannot support the deployment.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the peace that was brokered in Dayton that is supposed to resolve the civil war in Bosnia and Herzegovina is nothing but a thin, glass wall waiting to be shattered. It is just another cease-fire that will once again be broken by discontented parties. To send American ground troops into the thick tension that still prevails is nothing short of a kamikaze mission.

Many Bosnians want Americans to come and help enforce the peace established in Dayton. Unfortunately, this is not true peace. True peace does not require 60,000 foreign soldiers to police the streets. Bosnian Serbs living in Sarajevo are staging daily protests hoping that the peace settlement will be renegotiated. They are dissatisfied because under the Dayton agreement the suburbs of Sarajevo that they call home will be turned over to the newly created Croat-Muslim Federation, which most view as a fate worse than death. This one provision in a multifaceted

agreement is enough for some to pick up arms once again. Because Bosnian Serbs are so discontent with the agreement, their leaders announced they would hold a referendum on December 12, to ask their citizens whether or not they should accept the Dayton peace plan.

The fact that Croatian President Franco Tudjman, Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic and Bosnian President Alija Izetbegovic were able to sit down in one room together and over the course of a few weeks, create a plan for peace is, of course, nothing short of a miracle. President Clinton and his administration ought to be commended for accomplishing the unthinkable. The problem though is that only presidents and foreign ministers present agreed to stop the war; no one consulted the people. It is the people who have festered hatred in their hearts which has caused this civil war. There cannot be a workable peace solution unless the people want it, unless they are willing to put away their deep-seated hatred for one another and say enough is enough.

This tenuous peace which 60,000 NATO troops must enforce will be led by American troops and was promised to the warring factions before the American public could have its say. In fact, the understanding of the three warring parties before they came to the peace table was that America would be there to monitor the final agreement. But we cannot send 20,000 of your young, vibrant men and women to enforce a peace that is not going to last. President Clinton has promised Bosnia the lives of thousands of our young people for 1 year. Does President Clinton really believe that hatred which spans to course of hundreds of years is going to be resolved in 1 year?

Why do we want to subject our soldiers to the wrath of the Serbs? What will these young men and women be to angry Serbs? Targets. Targets of their frustration of being bombed by American-led NATO war planes. Targets for their frustration of losing large amounts of territory to Croatia this past summer. Targets for their frustration of being forced to accept a peace plan they do not agree to. Targets for the anger of Serbs who were bombed by Americans in Sarajevo. Targets along the slim stretch of land, Brcko, that the Serbs want expanded and handed over to them. And when our soldiers are not the targets of snipers they will be subject to the threat of thousands upon thousands of landmines that will be covered by the winter snow. Yes, the best way for factions who are reluctant to go along with the Dayton agreement to sabotage peace is for them to attack Americans.

And why should Americans be deliberately put in harms way? What vital interest does America have in Bosnia? None. We have no vital interest in Bosnia. Secretary of State Warren Christopher called Bosnia "the problem from Hell." Political leader for the Bosnian Serbs, Radovan Karadzic, who has the responsibility of drumming up support for the agreement said, "What is wrong with the Dayton agreement is that it has created a new Beirut in Europe. It is going to bleed for decades." Why does this require that we put American lives on the ground in a country whose hatred is older than our Republic? This is a civil war that must be resolved by its own citizens. It took nothing short of a totalitarian regime to maintain the peace during this century. One year of peacekeeping will not solve

their problems or further any of our interests. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I will vote today for H.R. 2770 to prohibit the use of Federal funds from being used for the deployment of United States Armed Forces on the grounds of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the President will be in Paris to witness the signing of the peace accord that will officially end the 43-month war in Bosnia. The United States will be standing proud as the instigator of the process that took place last month in Dayton, at which the leaders of Serbia, Croatia, and Bosnia agreed to end the savage ethnic warfare that has claimed more than 250,000 lives over the past 4 years. This will be a great day for the people of Bosnia, and certainly a proud moment for those nations involved in the peace process. There is much work ahead in implementing the vision of peaceful coexistence in the Balkans, but with the determination of all of the NATO countries to extend the guarantee of European stability, it is truly a cause worth the effort.

Under this agreement one state with a unified, constitutional government will be created. Free elections will be held throughout Bosnia next year. Territorial issues within Bosnia have been resolved, and within these boundaries, all Bosnians will have the right to move freely. Those displaced from their homes by the fighting will finally be able to return home. Best of all, perhaps, is that the parties have agreed to respect the human rights of all persons, and those individuals who have been responsible for the heinous crimes perpetrated against the Bosnian people will be brought to justice.

This agreement represents great progress. While some of my colleagues here in the House today have expressed skepticism, I firmly believe that this peace can and will work. The leaders of all sides in this conflict have affirmed a true desire for peace on behalf of their people who are weary from the harshness of the conflict they've experienced. The people themselves have encouraged their respective leaders to follow the course of reconciliation.

What is required to make this plan work is simple: a neutral intermediary to enforce the peace accords for a time sufficient to allow the establishment of the new government. Clearly, this role can only be served by NATO. No other international organization has the capacity and respect to undertake such a critical operation. The mission itself is one that NATO is particularly capable of accomplishing. But it is equally true that NATO cannot accomplish the task without the direct and substantial participation of the United States. We have an obligation to participate and we have a direct interest in doing so because of the impact on the stability of Europe. Without our agreement to join NATO on this endeavor, other nations would decline to participate and the peace would assuredly fail. And then the fierce fighting would resume.

I am confident that our participation in this peacekeeping mission will be both limited and well-defined. U.S. troops, serving under an American commander, have been given rules of engagement sufficient to provide them with the ability to protect themselves and carry out their assigned tasks. Our role in the implementation force, although significant, will be limited to about one-third of the NATO contingent, with more than 60,000 troops coming from European and other nations. And our role

will be limited in duration: the President has expressed the clear intent of withdrawing American troops in a year.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, the President's decision to send United States troops to Bosnia is an appropriate and necessary use of power by the world's only superpower designed to bring peace to the Balkans. It is a mission we neither sought nor savior. These troops are not being sent into a war. Rather, they are going to support a peace treaty. Last month, in Dayton, OH, the three Balkan leaders initialized a peace treaty that would halt the fighting between the Serbians, Croats, and Bosnians. Two months ago, while the fighting was raging across the former Yugoslavia, I would have refused to endorse a plan sending American troops to Bosnia. Today, however, American troops are not being sent to Bosnia to engage in an active military conflict. Instead, they form the backbone of a peacekeeping mission that will at long last bring stability to an area of the world that has only seen violence and misery for so many years. Surely there is risk in sending our soldiers overseas. However, it serves our national interest to help bring peace and stability to the Balkans and to Europe.

Before we send our soldiers to Bosnia, however, it is imperative that we develop a comprehensive exit strategy to guarantee that our troops will not fall into another intractable quagmire. As wisely highlighted by the Senate Majority Leader BOB DOLE, if we leave Bosnia without allowing all the parties to stand on equal ground, we will find ourselves debating these same issues in the very near future. The United States must ensure that before our soldiers return home, the Bosnian Army has the ability to defend itself and its people.

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly support tonight's efforts to prevent American troops from serving on the ground in Bosnia.

This Congress has voted repeatedly in Congress and told President Clinton that we had no desire to send Americans to participate in a peacekeeping mission that is of no vital interest to us, of questionable prospects for lasting success, and that puts at risk thousands of American lives.

I hope peace prevails in that troubled region, and that the recently negotiated peace holds and the bloodshed and misery in the Balkans soon ends.

But we have no vital interests at stake in the region, and should not get involved.

There is no overriding strategic or economic threat to the United States there.

The war has not yet spilled outside of the former Yugoslavia, and we have already taken steps toward containing the fighting.

And NATO won't fall apart if we do not participate.

NATO is a strong alliance, a collection of Western democracies bound together by common interest.

That common interest will not go away if we do not go to Bosnia.

As for our prospects for success, exactly how will a 1 year deployment of peacekeeping troops solve a conflict that has raged for centuries?

It took the iron fists of one empire after another to keep the underlying ethnic tensions in this area under control.

It is unfortunate, but true: signatures on a piece of paper and a brief intervention of for-

eign troops will not quell the hatreds that dominate the former Yugoslavia.

Yet to pursue this questionable objective, we are asked to risk the lives of 20 thousand American troops.

The President wants to put them in the crosshairs of sniper's rifles, and subject them to the jeopardy that comes with the thousands of land mines that are buried over there.

Angry mobs are already gathering in the streets to demonstrate against our mission.

We are sending our men and women into an unfamiliar and dangerous hornet's nest, and for the wrong reasons.

I support the troops, and am grateful for their efforts on our behalf.

They have a very difficult mission to carry out, and I am sure they will do a fine job when they do.

But it is a mission that will come at great cost, and it is one we should try to avoid for them completely.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, tonight, this House faces a choice. We can choose to support the President of the United States in his decision to help end the tragic war in Bosnia, in his decision to act with our NATO allies to stop the killing in Europe for the third time this century, in his decision to nurture a peace that without question will be fraught with its own risks and dangers. Or, we can choose to desert the President at this time of challenge to American leadership, to seek moral comfort for this country in the failure of Europeans to end the slaughter, to watch the war resume content that the vital interest of the United States might this time escape the blight of war in Europe. As between a problematic peace and a horrific war, I choose to support the President's courageous work for peace.

Mr. Speaker, many of the people I represent have contacted me to express their concerns about the Dayton peace plan for Bosnia and the risks our troops may face as part of a international force to implement that plan. I've had many of the same concerns myself.

Earlier this month I joined 14 other members of the House on a bipartisan fact-finding tour of Bosnia and other countries in the region to address these concerns. We met with American, NATO and U.N. military commanders and diplomats, soldiers from Colorado, and the presidents of Serbia, Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. I've also met with the President; the Vice President; Richard Holbrooke, the Assistant Secretary of State who negotiated the Dayton accords; Samuel Berger, the Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs; and Lt. Gen. Howell Estes and Lt. Gen. Wes Clark of the Joint Staff. I asked them the same questions that Coloradans have been asking me.

At a town meeting this past Saturday, I heard again from people in my district, and I talked with them about what I had seen and learned.

Based on all that I've been able to learn, I believe the American role in leading the NATO implementation force is essential and that the mission of the implementation force is well-planned and appropriate.

I'm well aware that as we go down the path envisioned by the Dayton agreement, there is no guarantee of success. I have questions about having the new civil and political institutions up and running after the one year NATO deployment concludes, progress that will be important to sustaining the peace. Nevertheless, our contribution to the peacekeeping deployment gives us the best chance we have

had to stop a dangerous war that has been raging for four years in Europe.

Critics of this mission have said that the war in Bosnia is really a European problem and that we should let the Europeans solve it. But the truth is that we cannot afford to duck our responsibility as the leader of NATO during this defining moment in Europe's post-cold war history. We have largely deferred to the Europeans on this problem for 4 years, and they have never been able to reach a consensus on how to solve it. Without United States leadership the war in Bosnia will continue. Two tragic world wars should have taught us what can happen when we turn our back on Europe in a time of crisis.

Our military mission in Bosnia will not be risk free; there will no doubt be casualties. But the mission has been carefully planned and trained for; American military leaders have been preparing for this mission for 18 months and helped to write the military annex to the Dayton agreement. The 1-year time frame for the military deployment is part of the plan that our military leaders helped craft—it is not some arbitrary deadline imposed from the outside for purely political reasons. The mission statement is clear, and our commanders in the field have unprecedented authority to respond to challenges and threats with overwhelming and decisive force. While it is impossible to plan for every contingency, I'm persuaded most have been anticipated.

Our troops are well-trained in the recognition, detection, and clearing of land mines. They'll be equipped with sophisticated detection equipment and protective gear. Protection from the hazard of mines is a key reason our military planners chose a heavy armored division for this assignment. And keep in mind that the Dayton agreement calls for the warring factions to clear the mines they have planted. Yet, there will no doubt be casualties from mines.

Our troops will likely face attack from some rogue elements outside the chain of command of the regular armies. We will have a remarkable capability to detect and track hostile elements, however, and overwhelming force to deter and repel attack.

The question of an exit strategy has been repeatedly raised by critics of the plan. This strikes me as a false issue. Exit after 1 year is expressly built into the Dayton agreement, with time-defined tasks and objectives. U.S. military commanders were quite clear that they have no question about when and how they'll depart. They also made it clear that if the parties to the agreement aren't serious about keeping peace and fighting resumes, we will withdraw our troops.

There are risks and problems in the civil-political parts of the Dayton agreement, too. It includes an ambitious timetable for economic reconstruction, humanitarian activities and the formulation of new political institutions, and the power arrangements crafted to create the new Bosnian state seem awkward at best. But a massive international effort has already been launched by the London conference to coordinate the myriad of humanitarian and political projects that will have to be undertaken to support the agreement. We can only hope that enough will be in place to sustain the peace when the troops go home at the end of next year. And it may well make sense at that time, under circumstances then very different from the last 4 years, for some international police

authority to assist with security for a longer period.

We should be under no illusion that Presidents Milosevic, Izetbegovic, and Tudjman entered this agreement out of altruism. Just as self-interest brought these three leaders to the table in Dayton, it will be self-interest that will encourage them to keep their bargain and make peace work. All three have calculated that their future lies with the West. Izetbegovic is struggling to find a way for his country to survive as an independent state. Milosevic is desperate to put a permanent end to the devastating international embargo that has destroyed the Serbian economy. And Tudjman wants to expand trade with Europe and to press for admission to European institutions.

So, the peace reached at Dayton is a messy, pragmatic arrangement. Sadly it is not a just peace, because it ratifies the gains of war. But I believe this peace is better than continued war with its horrors and injustices.

Mindful of all these risks and uncertainties and imperfections, if we don't keep our commitment to help enforce the Dayton peace agreement, we'll pay a great price. The war will resume, and we will have forfeited American leadership and credibility. If the war spills over to Kosovo and Macedonia, it would cause enormous damage to our security interests in Europe by drawing Albania, Bulgaria, Greece, and Turkey into the conflict. This risk of conflict between NATO member states and a broader European war can't be lightly dismissed.

Ten days ago in Sarajevo, we encountered a group of the long-suffering people of that city outside the Presidential Palace. An older woman, tears spilling from her eyes, told us that she had lost her son in the war; she pleaded that only America had the trust of the Bosnian people and the power to end the war. It was a poignant reminder that this is not a problem that can be solved by Europeans without American leadership.

The next day I had lunch with two impressive young Army troopers from Colorado awaiting final orders to Bosnia at their 1st Armored Division base in Germany. One of these men had taken his Thanksgiving leave to visit the former Nazi concentration camp at Dachau. Referring to the mission ahead of him, he said, "Congressman, if we have the power to keep that from happening again, we have to do it." A reminder of an earlier problem that could not be solved by Europeans without American leadership.

So, it is important to remember that this is not just about Bosnia. Other actors around the world are watching these events and will be taking their cue. If leaders of dispossessed ethnic groups elsewhere in Europe and in the new states of the former Soviet Union see that the international community is unable to act effectively, they may well challenge the political compromises that have been worked out in their states. Eventually, much of what we won in the cold war could be put at risk.

The President has not done an adequate job in making the case for the deployment of American soldiers in Bosnia. This surely makes it harder for members of Congress to support him, because it makes it harder for the American people to understand what's at stake. Still, the President's commitment to send a U.S. military force to help to enforce peace has been clear for a long time.

The President has shown courage in taking on this difficult responsibility in the face of po-

litical risks and public opposition. A vote for this resolution to oppose the mission will only serve to encourage both the enemies of peace in Bosnia and the enemies of United States leadership in pursuit of a decent international order.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I have deep concerns about the mission which the President has assigned to our Armed Forces to implement the Bosnia agreement reached in Dayton last month.

I remain deeply troubled by the President's decision to deploy United States troops in support of the Bosnia peace agreement. First of all, this is an unworkable agreement—that it is the best agreement attainable does not make it a good agreement. I have serious doubts that this agreement, even if it were fully implemented, would be successful in the long term. Moreover, the President has failed to make a convincing case that the conflict in Bosnia threatens our national security interests, or that implementation of the Dayton accords will resolve those concerns. He has also blurred the distinction between peacekeeping and peacemaking.

I am also deeply concerned about the conditions on the ground for our troops. Bosnia, particularly the area around Tuzla where United States troops will be based, is heavily mined. The great majority of these minefields are not mapped, and many of the mines in use in Bosnia are not easily detected. Furthermore, United States troops who may be taken prisoner will not be afforded the protections of the Geneva Convention for prisoners of war; they will not even have the legal status and guarantees of POW's.

Lastly, does anyone really believe that this mission will last only 1 year? Timetables on many international agreements in recent years have been much too ambitious, and inevitably have been revised and extended. I have serious doubts that this agreement, as contentious and entailed as it is, can meet its timetable.

Last month, I voted for legislation in the House forbidding the use of appropriated funds for the President's proposed Bosnia peacekeeping mission unless he requested a specific authorization of appropriations for the mission. I believe that the Commander-in-Chief, although not constitutionally required to do so in all cases, should always come to Congress for approval of the deployment of U.S. troops in area of conflict. However, I will not vote to cut off funding for our service men and women when they have already been deployed; I will give our troops as much support as they need to carry out their mission to the best of their ability. I oppose H.R. 2770; I support the Buyer resolution.

Mr. EWING of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the bills in opposition to President Clinton's misguided Bosnia policies. I support these bills because I support the men and women troops being asked by President Clinton to put their lives at risk.

The President believes he may conduct this policy without the approval of Congress. However, Congress does have a responsibility to address this issue, particularly when Congress is expected to provide the funding for this endeavor. This House has already voted twice advising the President not to send ground troops into Bosnia, but he has ignored that advice. I see no reason why we should now give him our consent.

The President has failed to explain to the American people clearly what our goals and objectives are in Bosnia or what national security issues are at stake there. He simply offers vague statements about securing peace. We are all deeply concerned about the terrible ethnic warfare occurring in Bosnia, but we cannot send American troops into a deadly situation without a clearly defined military mission, a firm timetable for their commitment, and a plan for getting them out. Furthermore, the President has failed to tell us how much this endeavor will cost the American taxpayers.

I commend the various parties involved in the civil war for finally reaching a peace agreement recently, at least on paper. However, the long history of violence in Bosnia demonstrates that this agreement could easily fall apart. If it does, this time thousands of American troops will be in the firing line.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the American people are strongly opposed to the President's policy. In my own congressional district, constituent phone calls to my offices have been more than 5 to 1 against sending ground troops into Bosnia. We should have learned from the Vietnam war that a successful military mission requires strong support from the American people.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, there is not a Member of this House that does not hope the Dayton peace agreement ends the bloodshed in Bosnia and Hercegovina. Three-and-a-half years of war and destruction must end, so that thousands more innocent lives are spared.

However, I do not believe that the United States must or should send ground troops to continue to be a leader in implementing this agreement. Thus far, we have provided essential air, naval, and logistic support activities to our NATO allies. We could continue to operate in this capacity in order to make sure the peace is kept.

Only a few months ago, we led the NATO air strikes against the Bosnian Serbs. How can our troops now be seen as neutral peacekeepers? Being viewed as partisans is a major threat to their safety, and already there is disension among the parties to the peace agreement.

The first bill considered today, offered by Mr. DORNAN, expresses the position I have held on this issue from the beginning. This is the view that hundreds of my constituents have voiced, as well. They believe that there is no compelling argument for sending ground troops. This conflict is replete with many ethnic and historical issues which will not be resolved by deploying our service members.

As a Member of Congress, I could never turn my back on the men and women who so bravely serve our country. Preceding the gulf war, I voted against similar resolutions to send in American troops. After they were sent, however, they needed and deserved the support of Congress. That is why the resolutions offered by Messrs. SKELTON and HAMILTON will also receive my vote today. We have a responsibility to give these brave and dedicated men and women our unqualified backing in their mission and these two resolutions accomplish that purpose.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, already patriotic American young men and women are in the former Yugoslavia preparing for the arrival of thousands of troops to help implement the recent peace agreement. President Clinton,

without the support of the American people or the Congress, has exercised his Presidential authority to send troops into action without the consent of Congress.

Republicans don't question the President's authority as Commander-in-Chief to send United States troops to Bosnia. We do question his judgment.

I believe the President has made a grave mistake. He has put Americans in danger without clearly articulating what national security interest requiring the use of United States forces is at stake in Bosnia. The President's promise to send some 20,000 United States ground forces into war-torn Bosnia was made in an off-hand remark more than 2 years ago. It became a commitment in search of a mission.

President Clinton made the promise without seeking the support of the American people. As a result, both the American public and the Congress have been shut out of the process that now involves sending American men and women into a very dangerous situation. This fact is highlighted by numerous polls indicating that close to 60 percent of Americans continue to disapprove of the Clinton plan.

There is no doubt that Republicans will unconditionally support our troops now and throughout the entire time they are deployed. We will make sure they are properly armed and have every resource available so they can adequately defend themselves.

However, the President needs to understand that he has not successfully made his case, as is demonstrated by the fact that the House has voted three times in opposition to his policy. Unfortunately, the President has chosen to ignore our counsel. Today will mark the House's final attempt prior to the signing of the peace agreement in Paris to express to the President the will of the American people with regard to sending our young Americans to Bosnia.

Mr. President, please take heed this time.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, we must support our troops. We cannot fail to support our troops. If we cut off funds to our troops we are failing to support them.

We must also support the President. He has created an environment for peace through the Dayton Agreement that hasn't been seen for 4 years in Bosnia. Four years of relentless killing; 4 years of non-stop ethnic cleansing; 4 years of unspeakable horror.

Every soldier knows that his chain of command is vital to his well being. The President is the Commander in Chief. Therefore the well being of our troops depends on support for the President.

The leaders of the warring sides have agreed to a peace. NATO is the only body that can enforce that peace. America is NATO's leader. Without NATO, the peace plan for Bosnia will collapse. NATO may collapse if the United States fails to lead in Bosnia. Turkey and Greece, both strong members of NATO, have conflicting sympathies in Bosnia. If the United States fails to act in Bosnia the war there may reignite, and it may drag members of NATO into it on opposing sides. Without American leadership, the peace agreement can not survive.

The opportunity for peace is at hand. We need to act now. We need to support the President's initiative for peace.

The Dayton Peace Agreement settles the territorial issues that caused the war. The

Dayton Peace Agreement commits all parties to the conflict to cooperate with the investigation and prosecution of war criminals.

If we fail to act now to enforce the peace, we may later find ourselves with no choice but to once again become involved in a broader European war. The Balkans have been an historically volatile place. We are presented with an historic opportunity to contain that volatility.

The peace agreement is now larger than Bosnia. It is about America's leadership in the world. It is about America keeping its word. If America fails to lead a peace plan brokered in the heartland of America, America's credibility around the world is irreparably damaged. North Korea, Iraq, and other countries that have aggressive intentions will no longer take America at its word. Failing to act in Bosnia opens a Pandora's box of worldwide troubles. American is only as good as her word. We must remain reliable in order to be taken seriously by every country with whom we conduct foreign policy, and that is every country in the world.

Do not vote to cut America's soldiers off. Support the troops. Support the soldiers. Support the President. Support America's leadership role in the world. Support the peace.

MR. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, as President Clinton Boards Air Force One for Paris to sign the Bosnian Peace accords, 20,000 American troops prepare to embark on a trip to Bosnia. They will spend the holidays in a strange and hostile land. Though I know they will serve with distinction and honor, I cannot support President Clinton's unilateral decision to deploy these young men and women without first seeking approval from Congress.

President Clinton is sending our troops to Bosnia to enforce an agreement that many Bosnians themselves reject. Look at a map and see how difficult it will be to police an effective peace. There are pockets of Croat-controlled areas, there are pockets of Moslem-controlled areas and there are Serb-controlled areas forming a virtual horseshoe around half of Bosnia. It would be necessary to deploy hundreds of thousands of troops throughout these various areas for many, many years—perhaps decades, in order to effectively separate and pacify these warring factions. President Clinton's politically inspired withdrawal deadline of 1 year almost seems to ensure that in the long-term, open hostilities will resume once foreign troops are removed.

Now I do not pretend to have the key to peace in Bosnia, nor do I wish the suffering to continue. That is why I salute President Clinton's attempts to mediate a peace accord. However, I regret that he was unable to Broker a peace treaty that would essentially be self-enforcing—one which would give all Bosnians incentives to uphold its terms and conditions without the necessity of massive foreign troop involvement. If most Bosnians are not convinced that peace is in their best interest, then I fear that the Dayton peace accords will be short-lived. And our troops will be at risk from the day they arrive in Bosnia.

I would like to remind President Clinton and my friends who support his unilateral troop deployment that Congress has spoken twice in recent months on this issue with a clear voice: On October 20, by a vote of 315–103, the House voted for the nonbinding Buyer-McHale resolution opposing deployment of United States troops to Bosnia. On November 17, less than a month ago, the House once again

spoke on this issue, voting 241–171 for Mr. HEFLEY's binding resolution stating that no money is to be spent on deployment to Bosnia unless it is specifically authorized by Congress.

In recent polls the American people have spoken on Bosnia. In a "CBS News poll" on November 27, 58 percent of Americans said they were opposed to sending United States troops to Bosnia as part of an international peacekeeping force.

My constituents have spoken on Bosnia. As of December 8, my office has received 603 letters and phone calls opposing United States involvement in Bosnia. How many have called or written in favor of deployment? All of 18.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot in good conscience support the President's troop deployment to Bosnia which might result in the loss of American lives in an ill-defined and dangerous attempt at nation-building.

As our failed intervention in Somalia demonstrated, American troops cannot force peace and good-neighborliness on a reluctant local population.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, once again the House is going to express the will of the American people regarding the Clinton policy in Bosnia. The American people do not want our troops to go to Bosnia.

Mr. Clinton and his followers have never made the case that this country's vital interests are at stake in Bosnia. That is why this House has repeatedly voted to oppose the deployment of U.S. forces there.

There is simply no compelling reason for one drop of American blood to be shed in that troubled country. Contrary to Mr. Clinton's contention that this is a NATO matter, there is no threat to NATO from Bosnia.

NATO is a mutual defense pact. The members of NATO are pledged to treat an invasion or attack on one of the members as an attack on all. There is not threat of an invasion of any NATO country by Bosnia. Bosnia is not going to invade Canada or Germany or England.

What is happening in Bosnia is a civil war. It has been a horrible bloody affair with thousands of innocent people killed or hurt. But, it makes no sense to inject U.S. forces into that situation when we do not have any vital interest at stake.

In my book, the injury or death of even one American soldier is not acceptable if there is no threat to the security of the United States. Clearly, there is no such threat in the case of the civil war in Bosnia.

I feel for the people of Bosnia and I hate the fact that they have been suffering during this war. It has been brutal. But, there are brutal civil wars going on in several countries and we are not contemplating putting our military personnel into those fights; we should not.

There is no more moral imperative to intervene in Bosnia than there is for United States intervention in Sri Lanka or Sudan. It is horrible that there is evil in the world and that men do wretched things to one another. But, it is not the job of the U.S. military to act as the world's security guard.

Our military exists to protect our national security, not for enforcing other people's peace treaties.

History is not on the side of those who, in my estimation, naively believe that we can solve the Bosnians' problems for them. The ethnic, religious, and territorial rivalries among

the Serbs, Croats, and Moslems are many centuries old.

The battles that the Bosnians are fighting today have their roots in the atrocities committed over the centuries. Bosnia has been conquered, controlled, traded, and oppressed by the various empires, kingdoms, and dictatorships that have ruled the region.

We cannot change their history and we cannot assuage their mutual grievances. The peace that was brokered in Dayton, OH, may make us feel good about ourselves but it is a paper peace and our soldiers will be shot at with real bullets.

We have all seen the old films of British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain coming down the steps of the airplane waiving the peace treaty with Hitler and boldly proclaiming peace in our time. Let's not repeat that mistake.

We intervened in the civil war in Vietnam. Let's not forget the lesson we learned from that. Congress should not give a blank check for the use of our forces to a President who has not spelled out exactly why they should be sent and what they are to accomplish and how we are to get them out.

The policy is wrong. The American people do not want it. This House has repeatedly rejected it; but, Mr. Clinton has ignored us.

I urge my friends and colleagues to vote to support the troops and to oppose the Clinton intervention policy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky). All time for debate pursuant to the first section of House Resolution 304 has expired.

Pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 304, it is now in order to consider the bill, H.R. 2770.

PROHIBITION OF FUNDS FOR DEPLOYMENT OF  
ARMED FORCES IN BOSNIA

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 304, I call up the bill (H.R. 2770) to prohibit Federal funds from being used for the deployment on the ground of United States Armed Forces in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina as part of any peacekeeping operation, or as part of any implementation force, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2770

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR DEPLOYMENT ON THE GROUND OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN THE REPUBLIC OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA AS PART OF ANY PEACEKEEPING OPERATION OR IMPLEMENTATION FORCE.**

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no Federal funds shall be appropriated or otherwise available for the deployment on the ground of United States Armed Forces in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina as part of any peacekeeping operation, or as part of any implementation force.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 304, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes and a Member opposed, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, those Members that were on the floor and missed the evening ABC news tonight missed some very graphic videotape from Tuzla.

The airport at Sarajevo has been closed all day today and the better part of yesterday. No C-5's or C-141's, our biggest transport airplanes, will go into either the Tuzla airport or to Sarajevo. It is going to be all tough C-130 Hercs or the C-17 at some point in the future when the runways are perfected.

Tuzla has 2½ feet of snow, it is snowing at this moment, it is going to snow all night. There is a frontal system throughout the whole Balkan area. The mountains, where the mines are, are all in dense fog. The winds are 25 knots gusting to 35 causing snow drifts, and they expect 28 degrees at the city levels, much less up in the hills, and the 2 foot of snow will stay for weeks if not months to come, and more will be added to it.

I wish someone in this Chamber could explain to me why this operation, Task Force Eagle, could not have been implemented the day after Christmas. Why do we take all these families, including mothers, away from their kids and their mates in Germany and a lot of reserve units having their civilian employment interrupted to go over there, 12 days before Christmas?

I am going to vote, of course, for the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON]. I have two Dornan nephews, a lieutenant in the Air Force and a lieutenant commander in the Navy who has 35 some missions in the gulf war.

They tell me privately, all the military people I meet with, that this is a terrible way to put men and women in harm's way, but once they get the call, they are ready to try and do their best.

This is going to come back to haunt a lot of Members, their Dornan vote tonight. December 13, 1995 is going to come back to haunt people, Mr. Speaker.

When a Gold Star mother comes to a Member in this House and says that you do everything to keep Americans from going back to Europe after 50 years of keeping their peace and two bloody wars, and the Pope did not tell anybody to put American ground troops in there so that this century would not end in Sarajevo the way it began in 1914.

The factor of supporting the troops is a given in this House. I do not know anybody in this House, the most liberal Member, the most conservative, I do not know anybody at this point after Desert Storm and what we did to our forces in Vietnam and tragedies like Beirut and the fact that thousands of young men and women die every year in training, I do not know anybody in this Chamber who does not truly have intense, deep affection for our troops.

But many Members have not met Herb Shugart, the father of one of our



two last Medal of Honor winners from the streets of Mogadishu. He would not shake Clinton's hand.

Herb Shugart told me the whole story. He said, "Mr. President, why do you fly a warlord Aided on our airplanes with Marine guard? You wouldn't ask my son's Army to guard him just days after he had killed 19 of our men. Why did you fly him to Addis Ababa?"

Clinton said to him, "It was a good military operation, Mr. Shugart. You son did not die in vain."

He said, "How would you know what a good military operation was?"

It went on from there, and finally he said, "I have nothing more to say to you."

The press, some of the press, most of the press, suppressed that story. I do not think there are five Members in this Chamber that know that our two Medal of Honor winners, Gary Gordon, buried in Lincoln, ME, and Randy Shugart, buried in Carlisle, PA, were not just dragged through the streets before our eyes but their bodies were horribly mutilated and then burned and then dumped on the steps of the U.N. every 2 days.

And then I am told by nice men like Christopher and Perry and Shalikashvili that, "Well, we've learned our lessons from Somalia." Learned our lessons from Somalia? Did we not learn anything from Reagan's mistake in Beirut? Did we not learn anything from Vietnam? Did we not learn anything from the cold in Korea? Ask CHARLIE RANGEL about trying to concentrate to fight when you are freezing to death.

No, we did not have to rush in to rescue our European NATO friends when we are doing over 90 percent of the airlift, 90 percent of the sea lift, 90 percent of the sea power in the Adriatic. More like 95. The air strikes were 95 percent ours in August and September. Ninety percent of the food, the logistics, 100 percent of the hospital at Zagreb in Croatia. And when it comes to intelligence, it is all ours, from the unmanned aerial vehicles to the super architecture of our big satellites. Is that not a Treasury commitment of the American people?

I am not an isolationist, far from it. I went up to Walter Reed Hospital and met all the wounded men up there. Chris Reed was trying to rescue the bodies, not the men, the bodies of a helicopter that went down September 25, 1993, days before the horrible fire-fight, and he lost his arm and his leg. His fiancée married him anyway—beautiful ceremony up at Walter Reed. I flew over 200 flags on the roof of this Capitol with my 5 oldest grandchildren. I sent little Medals of Honor to the parents of Shugart and Gordon because the Army had forgotten that parents raise the young heroes. The wives get the Medals of Honor posthumously.

This is a Gold mother, a Gold mother vote tonight. It is a widow vote. It is a vote to tell a couple of young kids and

a handsome young father why their mother was hit by a sniper in Tuzla or some area in those hills.

I wish all Members could get the intelligence briefing I had today. By the way, you can. Every one of us has a top secret briefing. Go get the briefing that I got today on who are our friends there and who are not our friends. The war criminals are on their best behavior, the victims are furious that they lost 49 percent of their country, and the older politicians who cut the best deal they could to have their nation partitioned in half, and we are going to enforce the partition, they cannot sell their younger people on the anger that they have lost what they wanted, not to be a multicultural state but an Islamic state.

The intensity of the hatred with some of these folks reminds you of the 8, 14-way split in Afghanistan, reminds you of the worst of Lebanon, the worst of Vietnam.

I am going to vote against Mr. HAMILTON's amendment, because I think it is naive and a fig leaf and it acts like all 20,000 troops are in there. The news tonight said, I stand corrected, it is not 97, it is about 150 people are on the ground. Period. Nobody is getting in tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to call this the Dornan-Scarborough—because he has led my freshman—Freshmen amendment, "freshmen" for the baker's dozen, the 13 of you over there, because I predict, without any fear of being wrong, that some seats are going to be lost in November based on how people vote here.

I want everybody to realize that we are a pretty elite group here now. Almost all of our kids go to college. This blue collar warfare that we started, putting our men and women in harm's way, started in Korea and it was perfected in Vietnam.

I am going to give some time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] to speak out for the families who have their sons and daughters wear our uniforms as police, fire people, deputy sheriffs, and in all of our services. Then I am going to give 1 minute to as many freshmen as I can who were on the trip this weekend, last weekend, or the weekend before who have a totally different opinion than some of the people who have already spoken.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Dornan resolution as the only crystal-clear vote this House will cast on this precedent-setting U.S. military involvement of our ground forces in an unstable former Soviet bloc nation.

I rise in support of the Dornan resolution as the only crystal clear vote this House will cast

on this precedent-setting U.S. military involvement of our ground forces in an unstable former Soviet bloc nation. The most assured way of maintaining our troops' safety is not sending them there in the first place.

Moreover, there is no possibility that the age-old hatreds that have fueled the killings and plunder in the former Yugoslavia will be calmed in one year. Reestablishing civility in that region will require years of dedicated commitment, and the resources to back it up. Other instabilities in that corner of the globe are likely to bubble up in years ahead. Unless Europe, now rebuilt 50 years after World War II, seizes its proper leadership role, the United States cannot keep filling the vacuum. The initial cost of U.S. ground force involvement is projected at \$2.6 billion including an initial \$600 million for rebuilding roads, bridges and infrastructure. The cost in American lives tonight is uncertain. This operation is high risk and its ultimate resolution unclear. Thus, before committing U.S. forces, it is critical to ask the Clinton Administration:

Under what Constitutional authority is your Administration committing 20,000 U.S. ground forces to Bosnia and thousands more to adjacent nations?

Under what specific treaty obligation and amended obligations is your Administration committing U.S. ground forces to Bosnia?

Please define peace-keeping.

Please outline the mission in Bosnia and when our nation will know it has succeeded and thus withdraw.

Please define peace-making.

In the past, when, where and through what legal or treaty authority has the U.S. deployed ground forces through NATO, or other European Security institutions for "peace-keeping" operations in the former Soviet bloc?

Since the administration's Bosnia initiative is precedent-setting—U.S. ground forces in a former, unstable Soviet nation—on what basis will our forces be committed to other internal civil wars in the future? What will be the U.S. military "peacekeeping" relationship to the United Nations, NATO and other such international entities in the future?

Has the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe formally requested NATO assistance in Bosnia? Please provide the document requesting such involvement.

What is the role of the Western European Union, if any, in the Bosnia deployment?

Is Eurocorps functional and what force level has it committed to Bosnia?

Describe the Bosnian Commission that is to settle property disputes and its legal structure. Is it operational? If not, when will it become functional?

How does the United States role in Bosnia differ from our role in Lebanon?

Do the three parties to the peace accord—Presidents Milosevic, Izetbegovic, Tudjman—represent legitimate authority for their respective constituencies? Through what legal process was each elected to preside over those countries? Please detail the nature of their respective elections.

Finally, why in this post Cold War era—when the U.S. citizenry has been clamoring for more defense-burden sharing by U.S. allies—has the U.S. again been asked to assume the central role in resolving this situation, even convening the peace talks in Dayton, OH, rather than on the European continent.



This matter is a defining moment in U.S. foreign policy in that the U.S. is being asked to substitute for European resolve.

In the NATO nations of Europe we have thousands of European trained, deployable troops that could be dispatched immediately to the Bosnia region in the event a final peace accord is signed in Paris.

Let me read to you the countries and the number of their combat ready troops:

Belgium .....	63,000
Denmark .....	27,000
France .....	409,000
Germany .....	367,300
Greece .....	159,300
Italy .....	322,300
Luxembourg .....	800
Netherlands .....	70,900
Norway .....	33,500
Portugal .....	50,700
Spain .....	206,500
Turkey .....	503,800
United Kingdom .....	254,300

Total .....2,468,400

The Administration states that Europe, since 1914, has been unable to effectively maintain the peace and there was no other recourse but for the U.S. to assume the lead in bringing the warring factions to peaceful resolution. We are urged not to become "isolationist".

The truth is the long-term prospects for peace in this troubled region are slim. Once the NATO troops withdraw, it will require 50 years of cooling off between warring factions and maintenance of borders by external forces to give peace a chance, not a one-year quick fix. And who will commit to that? Who will pay for it?

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Dornan resolution. At a time when U.S. troops are in the field, right at this very moment, the Dornan resolution would deny American troops the resources they need to carry out their mission.

This is a naked political ploy that, despite all the rhetoric, pulls the rug right out from under the feet of the very troops that most if not all the Members in this body want to support. You cannot have it both ways.

The gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] says there are now 150 troops on the ground. If this bill were to reach the President over the next several days, there would be at least 2,000 troops on the ground before it would be presented to him.

At a time when we already have a significant number of people there; what kind of message does this send, when Members of this Congress act to strip American troops of the resources they need? Could we even evacuate the area of those who have already arrived and will over the next several days be arriving?

□ 1900

I do not believe this bill would permit it. The Dornan resolution represents, I believe, a direct assault on every U.S. soldier on the ground in Bosnia and those who will soon be there. This resolution essentially could

take the weapons out of the hands of the troops and put, unfortunately, and maybe unintentionally, our men and women directly in harm's way.

I think we should stop playing politics with the lives of the young men and women who are there. If we really support our troops, there are opportunities ahead to vote for that. There is no question that this bill is not necessary and, in fact, could do a lot of damage. I think it is the height of irresponsibility, and I personally believe this resolution is far too far to the extreme. I believe it is really an attempt to embarrass this President.

But, more importantly, to those of us who will be voting here shortly, I believe it will, in the long run, embarrass those of us who choose to vote for it. I do not intend to be one of them. I think there are other alternatives available to us this evening, whether you are for or against this effort in Bosnia, that have a more effective and less destructive way of expressing the opinion of this Congress.

I wish this resolution had not been presented, but I think those of us who have the courage to stand with our troops need to oppose it.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to remind the gentleman who just spoke that there will be a lot of conscience voting on the other side. I respect that. But I believe all of the leadership over there, including you, voted against Desert Storm and voted against our troops. So let us not inject politics and hypocrisy here. Let us all speak with our brains and our hearts and respect one another.

I looked up how you voted.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH].

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I must tell you I am highly offended that the Member from California would call this a naked political ploy, when we in Congress are simply doing what is our constitutional right to do, questioning whether we send young Americans to die in the snows of Bosnia.

I sit on the Committee on National Security; make no mistake of it, every single person that has testified in front of the Committee on National Security has said young Americans will die in that battle. We have that right to ask the question.

How many times have we heard since the end of the Vietnam war, "Why didn't our leaders step forward earlier and stop it?" The troops are not in at such a degree that we cannot get them out. We have more Americans in Central America fighting the drug war right now than we have over in Bosnia. We have a right, and for those who say how dare we do it now, these are the same people that were telling us during the Dayton peace talks that we had no right to do it; then that we had to wait until after the Dayton peace talks. Now they are telling us we as Congress do not have the right to do it now.

Let me tell you, if not now, when? And if we do not have the right to do

it, then who has the right to stand up and ask the President why he is sending Americans to die in a conflict that his own Secretary of Defense says does not pose a vital threat to America?

The Constitution is clear. James Madison, one of the three drafters of the Constitution, said that the Constitution supposes, with the history of Governments to declare, that the executive branch of power is the most interested in war and the most prone to it. It has, accordingly, with studied care, vested the power of war in the legislature. That was from James Madison to Thomas Jefferson.

I want the Member from California, I want those who vote against the only true bill that can do something to stop the bloodshed now, to tell me during this debate what will they tell the parents of those children who die in Bosnia? What is the reason that we have sent them over there to die? Tell the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING], what is the vital American interest in sending his son over to die?

These troops are not cowards. People from my district have been over there for months flying missions. We are not isolationists. But tell us the vital American interest that is worth the death of Americans. And make no mistake of it, the President will tell you, the Vice President said it today, as many as 50 Americans will die over there.

So when you vote against Dornan, you are voting to wash your hands of this issue, and if you are comfortable with that, if you feel there is a compelling vital American interest, if you truly believe in your heart that a 500-year-old civil war with no vital American interest, according to our own Secretary of Defense, is worth spilling American blood, that is fine. But convince me, because nobody in the administration has convinced me or 75 percent of Americans that we have a vital American interest over there.

I certainly respect those who will vote against the Dornan amendment. I know this is a highly emotional issue. Nobody has made a case yet that it is worth spilling American blood.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HINCHEY].

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, for the last 4 years a horrible war has been ranging in the former Yugoslavia. It is a war that, with each passing day threatens to become wider and more dangerous, not just for the people in that country but for other countries in the surrounding region and for the world itself.

Already that war has claimed several hundred thousand lives. There are 2 million refugees in country and another 800,000 refugees outside of country.

On the Serbian side, there are already volunteers, including high-ranking officers, serving with the Serbians from former Soviet-bloc countries. On the Bosnian side, there have been volunteers from other countries, particularly in the Middle East. The war is becoming more dangerous, more complicated and more involved all the time.

A month ago our President invited the leaders of those three countries to come to this country. They sat down in Dayton, and after 3 weeks they signed a peace agreement. The fighting has stopped. Now they ask us to come and stand between them to make sure that the fighting continues to stop while they have an opportunity to rebuild their countries and settle their differences peaceably among themselves. They need NATO.

They said to us, and I was in Bosnia as others of us have been over the last weekend, they told us directly,

No one can ensure that this happens, that this peace continues, other than NATO, and there is no one that can lead NATO except for the United States. We need the United States. We trust the United States. We respect the United States. We want you to come here and make sure that this peace continues.

Our troops are on their way. They are already now on trains heading for the staging area in lower Hungary. Hundreds of them are on the ground in Tuzla.

This resolution cuts off all funding for American troops in the field. I met with those troops in Frankfurt just yesterday, had lunch with them in the mess hall. What they said to us, from officers down to privates, the two privates that I sat next to in that lunch hall, was this:

We need the support of the American people. We are going for this mission. We understand it is dangerous. We are prepared for it. Our morale is high. We can do the job, but, don't deprive us, don't deprive us of the means to achieve the objectives that you have set forth for us.

That is what this bill does. Unfortunately, it deprives them precisely and specifically of the means to carry out the mission that they have been sent there to accomplish. It would cut off all of their funding. Let us not do that to them.

We are sending them there on a mission that is dangerous and important for our country, for the NATO countries, and for the rest of the world to keep peace.

More than 60 years ago, a kind of ethnic cleansing swept through Europe. We did not step in in time. Let us not make that mistake again. We are there to maintain this peace. Let us not cut off the funds for the troops who are there to do the job.

Vote "no" on Dornan.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA].

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, the holiday season is a time for us to count our blessings, and it was in this spirit

that I came before the House last week to urge my colleagues to reflect upon the efforts of the peacemakers. I felt that the words found in the Bible expressed it best, "Blessed are the peacemakers."

After 3 years of starvation, mass executions, sniper fire, indiscriminate shelling and rape, the children of Sarajevo are ready to enjoy their first Christmas free of fear and violence. For the first time in years, families have an opportunity to share the holidays together without worrying that a father or a son will be dragged off in the dead of night never to be seen again.

In large part, our Nation, our President, its leaders, its diplomats, its men and women in uniform and its people are responsible for this state of affairs.

While I strongly support the humanitarian goals of this mission, I also support this mission because it is in our national interest. Is not preservation of the North Atlantic Alliance, which has kept the peace in Europe for over 40 years, important to America's national security? Is not keeping the war in the Balkans from spreading to engulf our important allies, Turkey and Greece, important to America's national security? The answer is "yes."

It is also a national interest to protect the constitutional powers, not just of this President but of future Presidents.

After 3 years, our President and our European allies have finally pulled the warring parties in Bosnia off the battlefield and to the negotiating table to end the bloodshed and death which has claimed the lives of so many innocent women and children.

Mr. Speaker, let us be messengers of peace and goodwill and support. Let us support our troops, America's national interests, our President, and the peacemakers. Let us support the Hamilton amendment.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, blessed are the peacemakers. Peacemakers? Maybe targets.

There is only one vote on the House floor tonight; I am going to vote for Mr. HAMILTON's, but I am going to vote for Mr. SKELTON's and Mr. BUYER's.

They are after-the fact, nonbinding votes. They mean nothing. Yes, there may be 2,000 troops in Bosnia before the Dornan amendment may pass. I do not think it will pass. But if it did, the President would veto it, and we could not override the veto.

Because, Congress, we know our history in Vietnam. What was the sense to it? What was the binding vote that declared war in Southeast Asia? There was none.

Congress does not govern anymore. I hear all of this superpower business. We are not the only power. Europe is not exactly a Third World military pushover, folks.

I want you to just think of this, while our young men and women, while there is no security national security threat in Bosnia, No. 1, and our experts tell us Europe has enough military personnel and money to provide the peace, while our personnel, ground troops, are over in Bosnia, French soldiers will be visiting Disneyland.

This is ridiculous. I keep hearing about NATO. NATO was designed and, in fact, created to prevent a Soviet invasion. It is time for Congress to realign NATO. Let the Europeans put up the big money. Let the Europeans put up the military. Let us support them.

My God, this is contained, and if we needed to send troops, if it would be exported out of Bosnia, we could send ground troops.

This is the only vote you have. These other votes have absolutely no meaning. I am going to vote for them, but you have just given the authority to declare war to one person, the President. I do not want to hurt the President. But it is not the President's authority to do this. By God, if we do not challenge it over Bosnia, we will continue to look in our history, at Vietnam, Bosnia, Beirut, Lebanon, Somalia. What is next here?

Wise up, Congress.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS], the distinguished deputy whip.

□ 1915

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the peace agreement between the warring parties of Bosnia. Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God.

This was not an easy decision for the President. This is not an easy vote for any of us. It is not popular, and it is not easy. But we are leaders. We are not called to do what is popular, to put our fingers to the wind is blowing. Our mission, our responsibility is to do what is right.

For 3 years, we have heard the cries of anguish from the people of Bosnia. We have been deeply troubled by the accounts of rape, torture, and murder. We wanted to help stop the violence, stop the fighting. But we did not want to get involved in a war that seemed to have no end.

But now—finally—we have an opportunity to support peace. This mission is not for war. It is not Vietnam. It is a mission to uphold the peace.

Only yesterday, the Prime Minister of Israel thanked America for leading the way. For fighting fascism and championing democracy. He urged us to continue our leadership, not just in the Middle East, but elsewhere, in places where our leadership—American leadership—can make a difference. America has always stood for peace and freedom because it is right.

If we fail to act, we lose our moral compass. We lose our sense of purpose, our sense of direction as a great nation.

We now live in a global village. What happens in Bosnia affects people in Boston, in Chicago, in Detroit and in Atlanta.

But I believe—I truly believe—we cannot, we must not stand idly by. To do so would undermine our position in NATO and throughout the world. Our involvement can make the difference between war and peace, between death and life.

How in God's name can we stand by? We have seen the ethnic cleansing, the slaughter of young children, and the rape of women. More than 250,000 people have lost their lives. More than 2 million people have been uprooted and made refugees.

If we fail to respond to the Macedonian call—to lend a helping hand for those in trouble—then the cycle of violence will continue.

At long last, we can make a difference—to give peace a chance. I plead with you my colleagues—stand with us. Stand with our troops. Stand up for what is right and just. Support our mission for peace. Oppose this amendment, support Hamilton.

Blessed are the peacemakers, Mr. Speaker, for they shall be called the children of God.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, since communism killed more people in Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam than the entire population of Bosnia and Herzegovina, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is not about peace and war; it is about war. That is what is going on over there, and they are not going to stop fighting just because we go in there.

I wholeheartedly support withholding funds from President Clinton's Bosnia mission. Although it is a drastic step and ties the President's hands, I do not feel like we have any other choice. The President has tied our hands, gone against the wishes of the American people, and this is the last best way I know how to show my respect for our American servicemen and women. They are helpless, following orders. But we, we are in a position to stop this terrible mistake before it happens.

I know how those soldiers are feeling. I was in the military for 29 years, and I recognize that we used to say "Let's go to war. Let's go fight that war, it is the only one we have got." And that is what some of them are doing. However, I was told by Senator HUTCHISON that the guys down in Fort Hood did not say that. They said "Why are we going there? Can't you stop us?" She said she would try.

Thirty years ago when I was sent to Vietnam in a similar situation, Vietnam started out as a peace type mission, no defined goal, no exit strategy, no idea whose side we were on, and a created incident to gain support of the Congress. A peacekeeping mission? Come on. Does this not sound just like a carbon copy? I think it is.

What is going to happen when our guys get over there, and if the rules of engagement apply, and they get shot at, and we start shooting back, what are their people going to say when we start killing them, killing Bosnians, killing Croatians, killing Serbs? We will do it, and we will get chastised for it.

Let me just ask one more thing for the guys over here voting against it: What are you going to do when one of our women soldiers get captured?

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS.]

(Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Dornan amendment. There is no more noble a purpose and no more practical a purpose for the use of American military strength than the purpose for which the troops are being deployed in Bosnia. Blessed are the peacemakers and peacekeepers. All armies are created and mobilized for the purpose of achieving peace. Troops fight to win wars in order to realize peace. To conquer an enemy is to achieve peace.

If peace is always the objective, then why do we belittle and challenge a use of American troops to maintain the peace in a situation where peace has been negotiated? Every soldier who serves in Bosnia should be saluted as a hero. The soldiers who keep the peace deserve all the medals and as much glory as the soldiers who fight hot wars.

Peace is always the objective of honorable military action. Certainly there are great risks. From day one in training camp, every soldier enters a world where risks are far greater than in the civilian world. In any foreign theater, a soldier's risks are greatly increased. But in Bosnia the risks are being taken to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, and to provide shelter for those who have been made homeless over and over again by the actions of military criminals.

We spend nearly \$250 billion a year to maintain the world's greatest military force. The American armed forces of 1995 should be declared an Army for peace. For all the years to come it should be understood that we are armed to promote and preserve peace. Bosnia should not be seen as a waste. The deployment of troops in Bosnia is a necessity to send a message to the military criminals of the world that thugs will not be allowed to rule any part of the world and go unchallenged.

American soldiers should not be asked again and again to do this in the world, but this is a clear and present situation. This is a situation that has been negotiated. This is a situation where peace is achievable. Let our Army help to achieve that peace.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, imagine for a moment that you are an American soldier who said good-bye to his family and you are on your way to Bosnia. Word reaches you tonight that the Dornan resolution has passed in the U.S. House of Representatives. The House of Representatives has voted to cut off all funds for Bosnian peacekeeping.

The gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] knows and everyone knows on this floor his resolution will not go any further than this House of Representatives, but it will reach these troops on their way to represent America.

This is a cruel resolution. It will say to the men and women whom we ask to wake up tomorrow to dress in their military uniform and to represent the United States that we do not stand behind them.

I think we have learned many lessons through our lifetime. We have certainly learned that when we have made the commitment to put our troops in the field, we in the United States Congress must stand behind them.

The gentleman from California likes to recount the fact that many of us voted against the Persian Gulf war. I did. The gentleman should also recount the fact that immediately thereafter there was offered a bipartisan resolution, which passed I believe without a dissenting vote, where we stood resolutely behind those men and women, regardless of our vote on the Persian Gulf war. That was the appropriate and proper thing for us to do as Americans.

Regardless of the fact that I do disagree with some aspects of this Bosnian peacekeeping, I think the President was wrong in not seeking Congressional approval, the fact is the troops are committed. The fact is they will look to us, Mr. DORNAN, and they will look to you as to whether you support them. And your answer to them is not a badge you wear on your lapel or any fancy ribbon that you wear on your suit, but how Members will vote.

Mr. Speaker, I hope Members will join me in voting to make sure those men and women in the field know that we stand behind them. This is serious, it is a serious commitment of this country. These men and women are putting their lives on the line. We owe it to them to take it very seriously. I urge my colleagues, whether you agree with the President or not, to defeat this cruel Dornan resolution.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I will not be goated yet. Mr. Speaker, my 22 years and 4 months in the Air force prevents me from rising to that fight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Idaho, Mrs. HELEN CHENOWETH, a freshman who has just come back from a recent trip to Sarajevo.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that the Dornan resolution and the resolutions and bills that we have passed already in this Congress is not a message to our boys who are preparing to be deployed. It is

a message to our boys who are preparing to be deployed. It is a message to the President of the United States, who is acting like a dictator. When is he going to get the message?

Mr. Speaker, yes, I was in Sarajevo, and I sat with Prime Minister Siladjic, who said very clearly, we have not asked for your troops. We have only asked that the arms embargo be lifted. We do not want to be an occupied nation. We want to be able to defend ourselves. We want to have military parity.

Mr. Speaker, they will only be able to have peace over there when everyone is equally armed. Let us not make a cheap political trick out of this by distorting the issue and using our boys in a political discourse. We are behind our men and women who will be deployed. There is no doubt about that. But, again, the Congress is saying no to President Clinton.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS].

(Mr. DICKS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to urge my colleagues tonight to think of the troops that we have in the process of deploying to Bosnia. I think a resolution that would cut off all money for ground forces would be widely misunderstood with the troops in the field, and I think would be a tragic mistake in undercutting of the U.S. presidency and of the Dayton agreement.

I would hope that my colleagues would give President Clinton what he needs tonight, and that is a resolution which strongly supports the troops, strongly supports the men and women who will be going to Bosnia, and I think the Hamilton resolution gives us that exact message and is what this Congress should rally behind.

I do remember the gulf war debate. After that debate was finished, we had a bipartisan effort to support the troops. I might recall to my friends on the other side, Speaker Foley did not call for a vote on this until after 500,000 troops were deployed to the gulf war. That was an appropriate time to do this. But to take this hard approach, to cut off all money, no money shall be spent, I think would be a terrible mistake. I think it would weaken the presidency, it will weaken our leadership in the world, it will weaken NATO and our leadership of NATO, and I think it is one of the most serious mistakes we will have made in this Congress.

So, again, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Dornan amendment and support Hamilton, which is well written and very supportive of the men and women who will be serving us so well in the Persian Gulf.

□ 1930

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina, [Mr. FUNDERBURK], the Member of this House or the Senate who

spent the most time on the ground, 4 years in Romania, as Ambassador FUNDERBURK.

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Speaker, 1 year in Bosnia's 600 year old war and out, and peace is to be permanently established? What a joke. U.S. leadership is at stake in the world? What a joke. NATO will collapse if we do not go? World War III? What a joke.

U.S. troops must be supported. True, we all agree, but the President can send troops anywhere and then say if we do not support this unilateral Federal Executive action we are not for our troops. Shame on the one who never supported our troops until he was Commander-in-Chief, and until he seeks leadership credentials. He should have tried getting support of the American people and Congress first, before he committed.

Mr. Speaker, saying our mission was a moral imperative are hollow words coming from people who, for the last 30 years, have turned a blind eye to atrocities in Cambodia, Vietnam, China, Romania, Iraq, and Syria. What about America's moral imperative to intervene in Bosnia? Bosnia is a nightmare, but why should American soldiers stop at Bosnia? Why not Sri Lanka, Peru, China, Nigeria, Indonesia, the Sudan, the Philippines, Western Sahara, Afghanistan, Algeria, wherever there is blood and fighting? The list is endless.

Our policy has always been and it must be to selectively engage our forces where we can do the most good but with the goal of protecting the national security of the United States. On those grounds, Bosnia misses the mark. We have no interest there, plain and simple.

I have lived in that part of the world, the sad part. The Dayton peace accord is a prescription for disaster. Its Byzantine arrangement of one Bosnia with two governments and three independent armies is farcical. Margaret Thatcher had it right when she said the best thing we can do in the Balkans is arm the Moslems and stay out of the direct fight.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support our only option here tonight for the Congress and the people, the Dornan bill.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote against the Dornan bill. I do so because I feel to support it would be a vote in favor of cutting our troops off at the knees. They are on their way. They are going to be there.

Mr. Speaker, in a later moment I will explain, in great detail, problems that I have with the U.S. policy, but this is not the time nor the moment to do that. I will explain why we should vote for the Buyer-Skelton resolution, which will put this entire matter in perspective.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say that I appreciate my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAM-

ILTON], setting the standard here. There are so many distinguished people on his side and mine that want to speak, and so I am going to limit all my speakers to 30 seconds so that everybody gets a chance to be heard on this, and then they may join my special order tonight for an hour to extend their remarks. Let us give it our best shot on both sides.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT].

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, it is very clear our troops understand what is going on. I talked to them on my way back from Bosnia. They know it is our job to argue policy, and by supporting the Dornan resolution it does not cut them off at the knees. It is shameful to say that it does.

Our troops took an oath to defend the Constitution and our borders, and we have extended that to America's vital interests across this world, but none of that is here in Bosnia. None of it. We are asking them to go above and beyond the call of duty, outside what they have taken an oath and sworn to do. I think we should realize that.

I am carrying a coin, and I am going to keep the First Armored Division in mind for 12 months. And I hope the guy that gave me this does not come back in a coffin.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY], who was discussed at great length on the Senate Floor today.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I think it is disgraceful that Members would get up in the well of this House and talk about cutting the knees out from under our troops. No one wants to hurt the troops. No one wants to hurt the troops. We want to get the troops there out, and we do not want to send any more troops.

When we debated Hefley back before Thanksgiving, the Democrats said it is a good idea but it was not the right time. Now they say this is not the right time because the troops are already there. When is the right time to say, Mr. Clinton, this is a stupid idea and we do not want you to do it?

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA].

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I approach this with some trepidation. I have never been one who likes to use our American troops to do things outside of what is absolutely necessary for the protection of this country. I take a look at this and I ask myself did we get the best deal for the troops that are being sent out there? Is this really the peace accord that is the mother of peace accords, that will guarantee us that the parties will finally agree to what they

have said? I ask if those paramilitary forces that are out there, under the control of no one, are really going to be stopped? And I ask do we really know how we will get our troops out should this operation fail.

At the same time, I know what I do not want to send a signal to the men and women who are going to Bosnia that I am not prepared to support them. Mr. Speaker, as I look at this vote, and I weigh the chance that I am sending people that are like me, in their thirties and twenties and forties, to go face off with people that we have never seen before, I do this with some trepidation.

I will probably support the Hamilton resolution. I cannot, in good conscience, support the Dornan resolution, and I would urge all the Members to not support the Dornan resolution. What we must do is do the right thing for those that are going. And I do not believe, at this stage, we can say that cutting off funds is the way we want to send our troops to Bosnia.

So I would urge Members to consider the fact this is them going. This is our chance to tell them that we support them, because they have no choice but to go, and it is our opportunity to say we will live up to our responsibility to do the right thing.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTLER].

(Mr. HOSTETTLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Dornan resolution.

Article 1, section 8 clearly enumerates the powers of the U.S. Congress and it clearly lays forth the power of the Congress to make rules for the regulation and the government of land and naval forces. It speaks very limited to the power of the President as Commander in Chief.

It is time to end the concession of this Congress to the executive branch in matters of policy as relates to the military. Support the Dornan language.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN].

(Mr. NEUMANN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, 30 seconds is a very short amount of time to say how I feel on this. But let me make a couple of things perfectly clear. I am 100-percent supportive of our troops. It is the policy and the idea of our troops risking their lives without our national interest at stake that I am opposed to.

So the message out of here, in 30 short seconds: We support our troops 100 percent; we do not want them in Bosnia. We have sent this message early in the summer, in the middle of the summer, late in the summer, again this fall. In case the President does not get it yet, we do not want our troops in

Bosnia; we do not want our young people to lose their lives in Bosnia.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING). The gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, Mr. STEVE CHABOT.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I am not convinced that the deployment of our brave soldiers in Bosnia will accomplish any lasting purpose other than to have put valiant American men and women in harm's way in a centuries-old civil war.

I will support the troops once they are there, but I want to state, in the strongest possible terms, that those troops should not be sent to Bosnia in the first place.

I am concerned that one of two things will happen. President Clinton says they will be out in 1 year. Either they will come back in 1 year and the bloodshed will begin anew, or they will be over there for a long, long time; and that is not acceptable to the American people, and it is not acceptable to me.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Long Beach, CA, Mr. STEVE HORN, who went over there 5 times as a professor to try to convince them to vote instead of kill one another.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

This is not a partisan issue. Anyone that says we are not supporting the troops has to be either a rogue or a scoundrel. That is utter nonsense. This is a constitutional issue; this is an institutional issue. The House of Representatives must authorize the money.

This is not England. This is not the Roman Empire. This is not some dictatorship. If we have Presidents of both parties, and that is true, that have roamed the world in election years to look better rather than grapple with the problems at home, let us tell them that they must start here for the authority. They have no authority as Commander in Chief.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am not a war hero and so I cannot stand here with any credibility that might in any way match some of my colleagues, one of whom is proposing this resolution. I am however an American, and I am a human being and a supporter of world peace.

I am a mother as well, and I had the opportunity just this past week to talk to some of the parents of some of the troops who are now in Germany, prepared to liberate those in the former Yugoslavia and Croatia and Bosnia.

What I am, however, is an expert on life and the quality of life and what it

means to live in a democracy. I would venture to say that the wrongest resolution we could ever have is the one that is on the floor right now: Cutting off the money, telling our troops we do not care, and simply saying to people who want peace, "The heck with you."

I do not know if we are aware of the human suffering that has gone on in Bosnia, some 3.2 million refugees, 200,000 dead, 6,000 elderly; homeless, and the mass graves that USA Today indicated, where dozens of family members gathered in the morgue of Splits Clinical Hospital to try to identify remains of loved ones, including watches, crucifixes, and pieces of clothing found with the bodies.

The article reveals that a BMW car key found on body number 28 was given to a woman who claims her husband, hotel manager Steko, age 33, had a similar car. The woman, Bozana Steko, 32, races home to see if the car starts, and it does.

I am not sure what we are debating here. I did not have the privilege to rise to the House floor and debate whether or not we should have gone into Kuwait when we had a Republican President. But I know there are many of my colleagues here that rose with all articulateness and emotional fervor, saying there was a reason to go to Kuwait. As a Texan, I know that we were talking about oil.

□ 1945

Today, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about peace. The American people have never run away from peace. They have run away from the loss of human life and the memories of Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, this is not Vietnam. We have a military that is enormously prepared. We have young soldiers who are committed to the principles of peace. We have a strategy of rules of engagement that allows our troops to shoot to kill. We do not have sitting ducks at the line of demarcation. We are sending armored divisions, and yes the Americans are in areas that they know they can cover.

There are those who are cynical. There will be dangers, sniper fire, possibilities of land mines, but Americans and people of the world have never been able to gain peace without taking risks.

But most of all, I would say to my colleagues who want to throw in the faces of our troops that we will cut off the money but yet, we are for you, as I have heard my colleagues say, I want them to simply tell the truth. If my colleagues are for peace, they have got to stand for peace. They have got to take risks for peace.

Having gone to Bosnia, I will tell my colleagues that the people there want peace. They want to be part of peace. They begged us for peace as we stood in the streets with Bosnian children.

Mr. Speaker, this is the wrong way to go. We must support our troops. We must be strong for peace. Let us act like Americans. Take a risk and take a stand. Stand strong for peace.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] who has one of the best chiefs of staff on the Hill.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, this is not so complex. Our troops are not in Bosnia. Our troops are in Germany. If my colleagues want our troops to stay in Germany and not go to Bosnia because this policy is wrong, dead wrong, this vote tonight is the only opportunity to do that.

If this vote passes by two-thirds of this House and two-thirds in the other body, it is veto-proof. It is the only opportunity that we have, with 66 percent of these two bodies acting out the will of 85 percent of the American people, to prevent this travesty from happening.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, we have only one remaining speaker, and I will yield the balance of my time to him. I understand the gentleman from California has the right to close.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT], a scholar.

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, with the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] leading this effort, it is patently ridiculous to assert that this vote could be construed as a statement for nonsupport for our troops. Please do not use this argument. With Mr. DORNAN leading this debate, there is no way our intentions could be misunderstood.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER].

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, the White House and the public will take a vote against Dornan as a vote for Gulf of Tonkin-like powers for a Presidential deployment of American troops to Bosnia. That is what this debate is all about.

Should we give the President the power to send these troops to Bosnia? If some nut or ruthless gang unleashes biological or chemical weapons or in some other way kills hundreds if not thousands of young American defenders, those opposed to this bill will bear a share of the responsibility with the President.

The President is sending them there. We have a chance to act. We are now in the chain of command. If my colleagues vote against the Dornan proposal, they are sending a message to the President that he can send the troops to the Balkans.

The cold war is over. The American people deserve better treatment than this. We should not be sending young Americans all over the world in every conflict. It is not fair to them. It is not good policy, and it will not lead to a more peaceful world.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult in a half-minute to sum up all

the arguments. Suffice it to say, clearly and unequivocally, we stand in support of our American troops. It is for that reason that we do not ask those troops to put on referee stripes to go and try to mediate a peace that is not a reality.

We call in American fighting men and women to defend this country and our legitimate national interests. There are no legitimate national interests at stake in Bosnia. Mark Twain said it best, Mr. Speaker: History does not repeat itself, but it rhymes.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON].

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, Winston Churchill said that nothing that ever starts in the Balkans ever ends there. I think that when we think about making peace with tanks, bullets, guns, rifles, and missiles, we are not fooling ourselves. We are not going over there to make peace. We are going to go in there and prolong and probably start a bigger conflict than has been going on there already for over 100 years.

So, I proudly support the Dornan amendment and will say this: If anybody thinks there is a Member of Congress who cares about our men and women in armed services more than the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], they are only fooling themselves.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], just back from Sarajevo and all points thereabouts.

(Mr. PACKARD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. It is the only way that I can express my view and the overwhelming views of my constituents to our President. The best way to support our troops is to not send them at all.

Mr. Speaker, the President's policy to send United States troops to Bosnia is simply wrong. I have recently returned from Bosnia and I can tell my colleagues firsthand that the situation there is grave. The destruction that I witnessed is horrifying.

We will not have peace in Bosnia with or without our troops, in my judgment. I opposed the President's policy before I went to Bosnia, and I oppose it more even after returning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] has 3½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. NORWOOD], someone who not only supports the troops; he is one of the troops, a Vietnam veteran.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight with a troubled heart. I rise tonight to ask my colleagues to support our troops. Support them by bringing the 150 home. Bring them home now,

before we get into a mess like I personally had to live through 30 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I served one "Mission Impossible" in Vietnam where we waged political war and no one really knew who the enemy was, and we had no political will to flight. Let us stop this madness. Is it not better we embarrass the President than to lose one American life?

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF], a member of our conference who just made First Bird Eagle Colonel.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, there is a vital U.S. interest in peace in Europe, but there is more of an interest in peace in Europe to the Europeans. The case has never been made as to why the Europeans cannot themselves send 60,000 ground troops to quell the situation in Bosnia. No case has been made why U.S. troops are needed to help them.

Mr. Speaker, just because we are a superpower should not make us a superpaty to do the Europeans' job for them. If there is a threat that the war will spread further in Europe, that is even more of a reason for the Europeans to supply the ground troops themselves.

Mr. Speaker, the best way to support our troops is not to send them to Bosnia in the first place.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, even if I only save 30 seconds for myself, does that mean that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], this very distinguished Marine, once and forever, gets to go right before me, or could I ask the gentleman to speak now?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No, the gentleman from Pennsylvania could be yielded to speak now. It depends.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH], a senior Member and a chairman of the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, these things never change. I have been in many of these debates. The American people are always conned. That is the truth of it, and that is happening again tonight.

Mr. Speaker, a year from now, I want to predict what is going to happen. When there are yellow ribbons all over America and the American people say, "When are our boys going to come home," these people are going to say, "We cannot leave now. Look what is going to happen to NATO. Who is going to take care of the American sector? It is going to be war all over again."

Mr. Speaker, if we move in tonight, we are going to be there for a good long time, and all of my colleagues know it.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER].

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, this so called mission is not—as the President would have us think—a peacekeeping mission—this is a peacemaking mission. How can we commit our troops to

keep a peace that does not even exist? Why should U.S. blood be spilled for a cause that is not in the interest of the American people?

Mr. Speaker, what will we tell these brave soldiers' parents that their children died for? Remember the lessons of Somalia and Beirut. Vote for the Dornan bill.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR].

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, every once in a great while there is a policy that is so misguided, so ill-conceived, so poorly planned, and so deceptively presented to the American people that drastic measures are called for. The Bosnian policy pursued by this Presidency unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, falls directly into that category, and there is only one way to stop it.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one thing to do and that is to pass a bill that has some teeth in it. Not just mere words; some teeth in it. That is what the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] has presented here this evening, and that is what we must do in order to stop this misguided and ill-conceived policy now.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF].

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, there are no vital United States interests threatened in Bosnia. Sad experience has taught us that it is real easy to move in the troops, it is very difficult to accomplish the objective after we are in there, and extremely difficult to get out in a timely and honorable way.

We must do everything possible, and that is what we are doing now, to prevent this folly before the signing, before the decision is irrevocable.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Dornan proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in reluctant opposition to the legislation by the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] to cut off funding for United States armed forces already on the ground in the territory of the former Yugoslavia.

The basic problem is this: the President has already placed United States troops on the ground in Bosnia. That is a fact, though I maintain that he had no proper constitutional authority to do so without advance congressional authorization. But despite my opposition to this policy, I believe we owe those troops our support and our blessing. Therefore, in this instance, I will reluctantly oppose Mr. DORNAN's resolution and support the resolution offered by Mr. BUYER which once again expresses our disapproval of the President's policy, but stands behind the well-being and safety of our young men and women in the Armed Forces.

The sorry chain of events leading up to this vote only serves to underscore the need to revamp the legal relationship between the White House and Congress in matters of war and

peace. I've introduced legislation to reassert Congress' constitutional authority to place troops into war or warlike situations. The key to my legislation is a binding requirement for prior congressional authorization for the use of U.S. forces in hostilities except in those cases where the President must act to protect the United States, its troops, citizens, or territories abroad. Until we in Congress act to reaffirm our prerogatives, we will find ourselves faced with this kind of HOBSON's choice again and again.

Frankly, I do not believe this peace accord will succeed in the long run, though I pray it will at least stop the blood letting for awhile. We are dealing here with an ethnic and religious war that is hundreds of years old. The best intentions of the Western powers are not likely to cool the flames of hatred in the region.

Furthermore, our Nation should not assume the lion's share of the financial burden and military risk in this attempt to bring peace to the former Yugoslavia. For more than 40 years, the United States has provided for the security of Europe. We have spent as much as \$100 billion each year to protect the European democracies from the threats posed by the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact allies. It's time for the European community to own up to its responsibilities and take up its share of the burden.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA].

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, a year ago we stood on the floor and we debated the Haiti resolution. This House had a very good debate on deploying United States forces to Haiti. We heard the same kind of concerns. We heard that people were going to come back in body bags. We heard all kinds of recriminations about the policy, about the United States deployment, about the ability of the United States Commander in Chief to put United States forces in Haiti.

□ 2000

Not long ago, I became concerned about what was going on in Haiti. I went down there on Saturday. I found out that Aristide is going to step aside. They are going to have an election, that the human rights violations have receded substantially, that the 22,000 troops we had there at one time have been reduced to 2,500. In 2½ months we will have all the troops, all the United States forces out of Haiti, and we will not have had one casualty.

Now, will it be a long-term success? All we did was allow them to have an opportunity to have a free election and to get their country in order. It will take a long time for them to straighten this out.

I have been involved in the Bosnia situation for almost 4 years. When the Bush administration was in their last year, I went to Sarajevo. I could not get from the airport into town because the shelling was so heavy. The shells were landing in the houses. Two young children were killed not far from where I was. The next time I went in, I

stopped at the location where 70 people were killed with one mortar shell in town. The people were in disarray. The buildings were destroyed. There was no heat, no electricity, and the people did not know where to go. The British commander, General Rose, said to me, stay out of it. We can handle it. The U.S. forces do not need to be involved. And I listened to that.

I told President Clinton that I did not think we should be involved as long as the fighting is going on; I adamantly opposed any U.S. intervention. I did not think we had any business going in as long as they were fighting.

Then the President took a real risk. A year later, I went over and talked to Gen. Rupert Smith. He thought it was time that something could happen there. Our emissaries went to Bosnia. Our emissaries talked to all the parties, and they did a marvelous job. I do not have the highest regard for the State Department, but in this particular case, they did a marvelous job in getting the parties to agree to a ceasefire, which has held for a period of time.

When I was there, I saw every single building in Sarajevo had been destroyed or in some way hit by shellfire. People were starting to feel better about what had happened. And the British commander said, we cannot do it. Only the Americans can cause peace in Bosnia. The British and the French and the Germans have to many long-term animosities. If you want stability in Europe, you are going to have to have American troops involved.

I still doubted it. I still had concerns. I believed there had to be a peace agreement where the troops withdrew. I felt the Russians had to be involved. I thought the terrorists had to be pushed out. And all those things have been agreed to.

Now we stand on the threshold of a very serious decision by the United States Congress, very similar to what we did in Saudi Arabia with a difference. We were going to war in Saudi Arabia. We are going to make peace in Bosnia.

I do not think that any of us take it lightly. I have no concerns about the patriotism of the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] or his feeling or anybody else's motives in why they believe that they should vote one way or the other. But there is no question in my mind that if the United States is not involved, that if we do not take the chance, and I sat down with the President of the United States for an hour and a half and with my year in Vietnam, with my different experiences in the Congress of the United States, like the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], wounded twice when I was over there, I know something about the fighting. I know how difficult it is. But the President listened to my objections and concerns. I told him of the military concerns. I told him that politically he could be making the biggest mistake of his



Presidential career. And I said, I do not expect you to make this decision based on politics. I would hope you would make it based on what is right and wrong, but I am just telling you the danger you are getting involved in.

He listened to me and obviously made what he considered was the right decision as the Commander in Chief.

There is no one in this country that I have a greater regard for than the majority leader of the U.S. Senate or the other body, no one who has taken a more courageous position in this incident, even though he has the same concerns that every person in here has about putting American troops in harm's way. But he made a decision based on the American commitment.

The President of the United States made a very tough decision, a decision he considered was right, a decision he considered was in the best interest of this country. It behooves us not to undercut that President as he goes forward to sign or to agree or to witness a peace treaty by the participants who have been fighting.

No question we will have casualties. But I would ask all of my colleagues to think about the involvement of the United States in world affairs. We cannot be the policemen of the world, but we can, when we see an opportunity, exert our moral force and insert our troops, who are so well trained, to do a job to make peace and not war.

I would urge my colleagues not to cut off the funds for these valiant troops who are on their way to Bosnia at this very minute. Defeat my good friend's amendment. Vote down the Dornan bill and vote for the support of the troops later on.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, a word to my dear friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA]. In the streets of Kuwait City a week after the war eight of us had people come up to us and thank us for bringing peace to Kuwait. And they watched our debate from their hidden rooftop antenna on this House floor, amazing. We brought peace there.

This is the gold mother, the gold widow, the child who loses a dad in the snow of Sarajevo, Tuzla forever. Vote for the gold mother vote.

If I were a Democrat, I would vote for all three. If I were a Republican, and I am, I would vote for mine and then I would vote to support the troops, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON], my pal.

This is a tough vote. I will respect whatever Members do on either side. But believe me, history is going to come back to bite us on this one. We are going to be asked to account for our votes on December 13, 1995.

Good luck. Vote your conscience.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of President Clinton's Bosnia peace initiative. This evening the U.S. House of Representatives debated several legislative measures ad-

ressing the issue of President Clinton's deployment of peacekeeping troops to Bosnia. I do not believe that it is constructive for the Congress of the United States to undermine the authority of the President and the confidence of our troops on the ground by challenging the powers granted to the President under the Constitution of the United States.

Though I will always be wary of the deployment of American troops overseas I am confident that President Clinton has exercised his prerogative and authority under the Constitution of the United States to deploy American troops to Bosnia as part of an international peacekeeping force.

Mr. Speaker, during my tenure in Congress, I have been consistent in my opposition and votes against the deployment of American troops in places such as the Persian Gulf and Grenada for the purposes of combat. The circumstances in Bosnia, however, warrant unique consideration of U.S. involvement.

The President has made it clear that the mission of the peace implementation for [IFOR] under the command of NATO is well defined and limited. American forces will be under American command, the deployment has a clear exit strategy and the mission will be limited to the implementation of the historic Dayton Peace Agreement.

Because of the peace mission the President is implementing and because of our strategy of integration, the entire continent can share the blessings of peace that unite our community of free nations. As we strive with our partners to overcome the division in Bosnia, we can also help overcome the remaining division of Europe. Bosnia, once the symbol of Europe's post-cold war disintegration and holocaust, can be the proving ground for a broader and deeper transatlantic community.

Today, we know the extent of war crimes committed against innocent human beings in Bosnia. The atrocities are particularly disturbing when we consider the children of Bosnia and those who know no safe refuge. Finally, thanks to the leadership of President Clinton we are presented with an Opportunity to ameliorate a horrific situation. American leadership will clearly save the lives of many of Bosnia's innocents that would have surely perished without our help. Hopefully, this peace effort will restore stability to their lives.

The President took a historic step when he invited the Balkans leaders to the Dayton peace talks. At that conference, the parties agreed to pursue peace as opposed to war. In light of this pivotal development, I deem it important that we support President Clinton's peacekeeping initiative and support the American troops who are on foreign soil as part of an international peacekeeping force.

Mr. Speaker, in Cleveland and communities throughout the Nation, our hearts and prayers are with our men and women in uniform and their families. The world will always remember their unselfish dedication to this peacekeeping challenge.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, with our troops on the move, and our national commitment clear, we cannot, should not, vote to cut off the funding of our military.

To do so would both abandon our men and women who are under arms and negate our world leadership.

Thus, I will vote to support our efforts; Concerned? Yes! Determined to preserve our strength? Always!

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Dornan bill which prohibits funding for the deployment of United States armed forces on the ground in the Republic of Bosnia.

Tomorrow the Presidents of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, and Serbia will sign the Dayton peace agreement which assumes the commitment of 60,000 NATO troops to implement its provisions. At least 20,000 of those troops will be American soldiers. Advance troops have already been sent into Bosnia, and the President has said that the troops are committed regardless of whether Congress grants its approval.

For 2½ years President Clinton turned his back on his campaign promises to take decisive action against the aggressors, and his administration further compounded the flawed policy—which had begun in the Bush administration—when it failed to focus, in a meaningful way, on the conflict and the atrocities, and the pleas of the Bosnian Government to permit the means to protect themselves. In fact, I introduced the legislation calling for the unilateral lifting of the embargo against Bosnia. A similar bill, the Bosnia and Herzegovina Self-Defense Act of 1995, was overwhelmingly supported in both the House and Senate. The President chose to veto the bill on August 11.

The Dayton agreement—with the commitment of troops embedded into its fiber—has become the President's answer to the dilemma in the former Yugoslavia. Mr. Speaker, the President left no alternatives for the American people and the Congress.

The President prematurely made commitments to send U.S. troops to Bosnia, first to enforce the Vance-Owen plan, then the Vance-Stoltenberg plan, then the Contact Group plan, then the evacuation of UNPROFOR, and now the Dayton agreement. The President raised the expectations of our allies as well as those of the parties to the conflict that American ground forces would indeed be deployed in Bosnia.

Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to approve the deployment of our ground troops to this mission.

The White House asserts that failure to deploy ground troops would have serious consequences for our status as a leading force in the world. Perhaps, but any loss of prestige is a consequence the record shows of the President's hasty promise and eagerness to deploy U.S. ground troops to enforce any plan. The premature withdrawal of troops—either in response to military losses or simply in compliance with the convenient time frame set by the administration—without completing a realizable mission is damaging to the morale of the American military forces and the credibility of the United States. Questions remain about the agreement the troops are being sent to implement. Details about how and who will train and provide arms to the Bosnians are being provided piecemeal with the latest understanding being provided in a letter from the President. Will there be a clear delineation between the role of the NATO forces and the agreement's assurances of creating a climate conducive to elections, the return of refugees to their homes and reconstruction of the region?

The President has prematurely committed our troops without providing the Congress and the American people enough confidence that the military strategy has been thoroughly examined, defined and structured. Therefore, I

feel I must vote in favor of H.R. 2707 prohibiting the deployment of U.S. ground forces to Bosnia.

Mr. FLANAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN]. Before I begin, however, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FUNDERBURK], our former Ambassador to Romania.

President Clinton gave a speech before the American people November 27, 1995. He did not make a compelling case for sending United States ground troops into Bosnia. I do not believe that American interests are at stake or that our national security is being threatened in Bosnia. Therefore, I do not agree with the President's decision to send American troops into Bosnia-Herzegovina.

As a veteran of 5 years of active duty as a combat arms army officer, I am well aware of the risks associated with the deployment of a large force into a hostile environment. Our sons and daughters and brothers and sisters in the military are an extraordinary resource that we must not place at needless risk.

Some say America's international prestige is on the line, and that if we do not send the troops it will be diminished in the eyes of the world. But, I believe that our prestige will be weakened much more if young American men and women start coming home as fallen victims of a failed and poorly outlined foreign policy.

The situation in Bosnia-Herzegovina is deplorable, but the basic fact remains that America's vital interests are in no way threatened by that internal conflict. Allowing our young men and women to fight and die for anything less than our vital interests is immoral and reprehensible and I will not support it.

When the loved ones of those who will have needlessly given their lives for the Bosnia mission come to see us, will we honestly be able to tell them that their loved one sacrificed their life on a mission which served a noble purpose and that they did not die in vain? Can we tell them that their sacrifice advanced the cause of world freedom? Can we tell them that their effort was absolutely vital in protecting the security interests of our great Republic? We all know the true answer to these questions.

The administration has yet to really define America's mission in Bosnia, including a detailed explanation of why it would serve our national security interest. No such definition has been forthcoming, nor is one likely to be, in my opinion.

The situation in Bosnia strikes me as being a lot like the situation preceding the Lebanon fiasco of the early 1980's where over 200 young marines lost their lives in a hopeless crusade for peace when one of the chief belligerents of the conflict viewed the United States not as a peacemaker, but as an ally of another belligerent force. No, Mr. Chairman, sending American troops to Bosnia is not good foreign policy, it's a recipe for disaster and we in Congress have an obligation to prevent it.

Sending our troops to Bosnia may achieve one particular result, it may well unite all the warring factions. And they will all be united against us as their common enemy.

It was just last month that I, and the majority of the House, supported H.R. 2606, a bill which prohibited the use of funds appropriated

to the Department of Defense from being used for the ground deployment of United States armed forces in the Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina as part of any peacekeeping operation, or as part of any implementation force, unless funds for such deployment are specifically appropriated by law. On October 30, 1995, I also supported, as did the majority of the House, House Resolution 247 expressing the sense of the House that no United States ground forces should be deployed to Bosnia without congressional approval. Tonight, I continue in my steadfast opposition to sending our troops to Bosnia and believe the best way of showing that opposition is by supporting H.R. 2770.

The war in Bosnia-Herzegovina is an 800-year-old struggle which is not ours. There is nothing going on in the Balkans that is worth losing one American life. I will never vote to send my neighbors' kids into that meat grinder. There is no discernable American interest, therefore there will be no American lives lost with my vote. There is no price in the Balkans which I am willing to pay with the blood of our military men and women.

By passing H.R. 2770, the House will be exercising its Article I power of the purse and ensuring that we have a say in whether the taxpayer will pay to have American troops thrown into the quagmire in Bosnia. And what we are saying is that we will not appropriate funds for this needless mission that has no vital American interest at stake.

The best way to support our troops is not to send them to Bosnia, and without the necessary funding they will be unable to go. That is the best way we can show our support for our troops. Should it wind up, however, that they have to go, we must ensure that we give them, and pay for, the best logistical support. We want them to be as well equipped as possible so that they will be able to finish the mission and return home as quickly as this President may permit.

Mr. Chairman, colleagues on both sides of the aisle, for the sake of America's sacred military honor and lives, we must pass H.R. 2770 and pass it tonight.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky). Pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 304, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 210, nays 218, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 856]

YEAS—210

Allard	Barcia	Bilbray
Archer	Barr	Billakis
Armey	Barrett (NE)	Bonilla
Bachus	Bartlett	Bono
Baker (CA)	Barton	Bryant (TN)
Baker (LA)	Bass	Bryant (TX)
Ballenger	Bereuter	Bunning

Burton	Hayes	Petri
Buyer	Hayworth	Pombo
Calvert	Hefley	Porter
Camp	Heineman	Pryce
Canady	Herger	Quillen
Chabot	Hilleary	Radanovich
Chambliss	Hoekstra	Ramstad
Chenoweth	Hoke	Regula
Christensen	Horn	Rivers
Chrysler	Hostettler	Roberts
Coble	Hunter	Rogers
Coburn	Hutchinson	Rohrabacher
Collins (GA)	Hyde	Ros-Lehtinen
Combest	Inglis	Roth
Condit	Istook	Roukema
Cooley	Jacobs	Royce
Cox	Johnson (CT)	Salmon
Crane	Johnson, Sam	Sanford
Crapo	Jones	Saxton
Cremeans	Kaptur	Scarborough
Cubin	Kasich	Schaefer
Cunningham	Kelly	Schiff
Danner	Kim	Schroeder
Deal	Kingston	Seastrand
DeLay	Klecicka	Sensenbrenner
Diaz-Balart	Klug	Shadegg
Dickey	Knollenberg	Shaw
Doggett	LaHood	Shays
Doolittle	Largent	Shuster
Dornan	LaTourette	Skeen
Duncan	Laughlin	Smith (MI)
Dunn	Lazio	Smith (NJ)
Ehrlich	Lewis (KY)	Smith (TX)
Emerson	Lightfoot	Smith (WA)
English	Linder	Solomon
Ensign	Lipinski	Souder
Evans	LoBiondo	Spence
Everett	Lofgren	Stearns
Ewing	Longley	Stockman
Fawell	Lucas	Stump
Fields (TX)	Manzullo	Talent
Flanagan	Martini	Tate
Foley	McCollum	Tauzin
Forbes	McCrery	Taylor (MS)
Fowler	McDade	Taylor (NC)
Fox	McHugh	Thomas
Franks (CT)	McIntosh	Thornberry
Frisa	McKeon	Tiahrt
Funderburk	Metcalfe	Trafficant
Gallegly	Meyers	Upton
Ganske	Mica	Waldholtz
Geren	Miller (FL)	Walker
Gilman	Moorhead	Walsh
Goodling	Myers	Wamp
Gordon	Myrick	Watts (OK)
Graham	Nethercutt	Weldon (FL)
Greenwood	Neumann	Weldon (PA)
Gutknecht	Ney	Weller
Hall (TX)	Norwood	Whitfield
Hancock	Oxley	Wise
Hansen	Packard	Young (AK)
Hastert	Parker	Young (FL)
Hastings (WA)	Peterson (MN)	Zeliff

NAYS—218

Abercrombie	Clement	Ford
Ackerman	Clinger	Frank (MA)
Andrews	Clyburn	Franks (NJ)
Baessler	Coleman	Frelinghuysen
Baldacci	Collins (IL)	Frost
Barrett (WI)	Collins (MI)	Furse
Bateman	Conyers	Gejdenson
Becerra	Costello	Gekas
Beilenson	Coyne	Gephardt
Bentsen	Cramer	Gibbons
Berman	Davis	Gilchrest
Bevill	de la Garza	Gillmor
Bishop	DeFazio	Gonzalez
Bliley	DeLauro	Goodlatte
Blute	Dellums	Goss
Boehlert	Deutsch	Green
Boehner	Dicks	Gunderson
Bonior	Dingell	Gutierrez
Borski	Dixon	Hall (OH)
Boucher	Dooley	Hamilton
Brewster	Doyle	Harman
Browder	Dreier	Hastings (FL)
Brown (CA)	Durbin	Hefner
Brown (FL)	Edwards	Hilliard
Brown (OH)	Ehlers	Hinchey
Brownback	Engel	Hobson
Bunn	Eshoo	Holden
Burr	Farr	Houghton
Callahan	Fattah	Hoyer
Cardin	Fazio	Jackson-Lee
Castle	Fields (LA)	Jefferson
Chapman	Filner	Johnson (SD)
Clay	Flake	Johnson, E. B.
Clayton	Foglietta	Johnston

Kanjorski	Mollohan	Serrano
Kennedy (MA)	Montgomery	Sisisky
Kennedy (RI)	Moran	Skaggs
Kennelly	Morella	Skelton
Kildee	Murtha	Slaughter
King	Nadler	Spratt
Klink	Neal	Stark
Kolbe	Nussle	Stenholm
LaFalce	Oberstar	Stokes
Lantos	Obey	Studds
Latham	Olver	Stupak
Leach	Ortiz	Tanner
Levin	Orton	Tejeda
Lewis (CA)	Owens	Thompson
Lewis (GA)	Pallone	Thornton
Lincoln	Pastor	Thurman
Livingston	Paxon	Torkildsen
Lowey	Payne (NJ)	Torres
Luther	Payne (VA)	Torricelli
Maloney	Pelosi	Towns
Manton	Peterson (FL)	Vento
Markey	Pickett	Visclosky
Martinez	Pomeroy	Volkmer
Mascara	Portman	Vucanovich
Matsui	Poshard	Ward
McCarthy	Quinn	Waters
McDermott	Rahall	Watt (NC)
McHale	Rangel	Waxman
McKinney	Reed	White
McNulty	Richardson	Wicker
Meehan	Roemer	Williams
Meek	Rose	Wilson
Menendez	Roybal-Allard	Wolf
Mfume	Rush	Woolsey
Miller (CA)	Sabo	Wyden
Minge	Sanders	Wynn
Mink	Sawyer	Yates
Moakley	Schumer	Zimmer
Molinari	Scott	

## NOT VOTING—4

McInnis	Tucker
Riggs	Velazquez

## □ 2029

Mr. BRYANT of Texas changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was not passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 856, I was unable to be present because of a prior family commitment. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

## □ 2030

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky). Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 304, it is now in order to consider House Resolution 302.

## RELATING TO DEPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN BOSNIA TO ENFORCE PEACE AGREEMENT

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 304, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 302) relating to the deployment of United States Armed Forces in and around the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina to enforce the peace agreement between the parties to the conflict in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of House Resolution 302 is as follows:

## H. RES. 302

*Resolved,*

## SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The House of Representatives finds the following:

(1) On October 30, 1995, the House of Representatives agreed to H. Res. 247, which expressed the sense of the House of Representatives that in the negotiations of any peace agreement regarding the conflict in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina there should not be a presumption that United States Armed Forces would be deployed to that country to enforce such an agreement, and that in any event, no United States Armed Forces should be deployed on the ground in the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina to enforce such an agreement until the Congress has approved such a deployment.

(2) On November 17, 1995, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 2606, which provided that none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense could be obligated or expended for the deployment on the ground of United States Armed Forces in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina unless funds for such deployment were specifically appropriated by law.

(3) Despite the expressed will of the House of Representatives heretofore mentioned, the President has chosen to proceed with the deployment of approximately 20,000 members of the United States Armed Forces on the ground in the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina to enforce the peace agreement among the parties to the conflict in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina initiated in Dayton, Ohio, on November 21, 1995.

## SEC. 2. DECLARATIONS OF POLICY.

The House of Representatives declares that—

(1) it reiterates serious concerns and opposition to the President's policy that results in the deployment of 20,000 members of the United States Armed Forces on the ground in the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina;

(2) it is confident that the members of the United States Armed Forces, in whom it has the greatest pride and admiration, will perform their responsibilities with professional excellence, dedicated patriotism, and exemplary courage;

(3) the President and the Secretary of Defense should rely on the judgment of the commander of the United States Armed Forces that are deployed in and around the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina in all matters affecting the safety, support, and well-being of such members of the Armed Forces;

(4) the President and the Secretary of Defense should ensure that the commander of the United States Armed Forces that are deployed in and around the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina is furnished the resources and support that he needs to ensure the safety, support, and well-being of such members of the Armed Forces; and

(5) the United States Government in all respects should be impartial and evenhanded with all parties to the conflict in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina as necessary to assure the safety and protection of the United States Armed Forces in and around the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 304, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 30 minutes. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] will be recognized in opposition.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER].

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, there are many in this body, both Republicans and Democrats, who fundamentally agree that the President's policy in the Balkans is ill-conceived, poorly defined, and highly dangerous. The House has been heard on this issue.

It is ill-conceived, because the President 2 years ago promised 25,000 U.S. troops to enforce a future peace agreement without knowing what the situation would be on the ground. This commitment of 25,000 United States troops on the ground also is ill-conceived because the United States has lost the protection of neutrality after having bombed Bosnian Serbs and promising to arm and train Bosnia Moslems. The United States troops could become targets and casualties.

The implementation has been poorly defined in that the President has set a date certain as an exit strategy. If there are vital national security interests to place troops on the ground in the Balkans, then that is what is used to define your exit strategy. What is the success and what is the failure? You see, there are also other concerns, whether it is mission creep, whether it is the issue of the Nation-building exercises.

Let me also state this: The implementation plan we all understand will be highly dangerous, but it makes no sense to place U.S. troops on the ground that have lost the protection of neutrality.

Many of recognize the threat to the U.S. forces will not come from actual company or battalion size or platoon size attacks upon U.S. forces. It will come through cowardly acts of terror, whether it be by sniper, whether it be by bombings, whether it be by booby traps or accidents.

Let me share that this House has already been heard on this issue twice. First, we sent an overwhelming message, a bipartisan message, in that 315 Members of this body said "Mr. President, do not negotiate a peace agreement based on the precondition that the U.S. troops will be there to implement whatever agreement you sign." He ignored that and he went forward. Then we had the Hefley amendment, and again the President ignored the Hefley amendment and proceeded anyway.

So now what we are doing here today is sending another message to the President: "Mr. President, we reiterate our prior positions and also oppose United States ground troops in Bosnia."

It is now our congressional oversight responsibility to narrow the parameters, and that is exactly what we do. We are saying as to matters on the field, listen to the commanders, give them the resources they need, make sure that we protect our force by making sure they are impartial and evenhanded to the conflict, and also we have the confidence in the U.S. Armed Forces to do their mission.

Mr. Torricelli. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New Jersey for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, for the past 3 years, we have heard colleagues on both sides of the aisle, but particularly the Republican side of the aisle, say that the United States has not been forceful. We have been hearing for the past 3 years that the United States has not been forceful, that we have left the European allies to do the job in Bosnia, and they have been doing it ineffectively.

Now the President takes the bull by the horns and hammers out an agreement in Dayton and we are second-guessing and undermining and playing totally politics with the President.

Mr. Speaker, I was one of the Democrats that crossed party lines and supported President Bush during the Persian Gulf war. I did so because I believed that it was in the best interests of America not to undermine the President of the United States at such a crucial time in foreign policy. I believed that then, and I believe it now.

I would no more undermine President Clinton than I would undermine President Bush. We have been watching for nearly 4 years now, and we have seen visions of a new Holocaust rearing its ugly head in Europe again, 50 years after the end of the worst Holocaust in world history. We have seen ethnic cleansing, emaciated people, rapes, pilages. I think America does have a moral obligation to act. I do think that the stability of Europe is certainly in the vital interests of the U.S.

The NATO alliance is certainly important. If we were to do nothing now, the NATO alliance would be rendered impotent and go down the drain. So I do think we have a vital interests there. We are the leaders of the free world and we have to lead. We have seen in other parts of the world that things do not move until the U.S. acts, in the Middle East, South Africa, and Ireland. If we do not act, war will break out again, and it could such more countries into a greater war. We saw what appeasement did in the 1930's with Hitler, and when the United States and other nations did not step in, it led to a larger war.

When we talk about the Persian Gulf war, I remember my Republican colleagues at that time saying support the President, support the President. My God, during the Persian Gulf war we sent 50,000 troops to fight in a war, and the Republicans cheered. This is 20,000 troops to keep a peace. All the warring factions have invited us in. The mission is clearly defined, and the Pentagon, which is usually skeptical about peacekeeping, supports this and says it is doable and will be successful.

The same people who predicted doom and gloom in Haiti and were wrong are predicting gloom and doom again. So

my colleagues, let us not undermine our troops, let us not undermine our President. We are the leaders of the free world, not an isolationist nation.

Mr. Speaker, we should defeat the Buyer resolution and support the Hamilton resolution, which supports our troops. The button I am wearing says blessed are the peacemakers, and blessed are the peacemakers. Blessed are our brave men and women, blessed are our troops, and blessed is our Nation in the undertaking we are about to do. Nothing could be more noble than what this country does, and nothing can be more noble than to end the carnage in Bosnia.

We are coming in as peacemakers. We are making peace. We are not fighting a war. We are giving that nation a chance to put itself together. In doing so we are strengthening NATO and we are strengthening ourselves. This is not the time to turn to isolationism. We accept the leadership of the free world. Nobody anointed us with it. We wanted it. We have it. We are to act like leaders, and here in Congress, no matter what the polls say, we are elected leaders, and we have to lead.

Mr. Speaker, I think what is going on now is in the best defining interests of our country. This is a great Nation, it has always stood for what is right, and as the President says, what we are doing is the right thing to do. Defeat this resolution. Support Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

(Mrs. ROUKEMA asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I rise as many of my colleagues before me have done, with grave reservations about the President's policy towards Bosnia and particularly has commitment to deploying at least 20,000 American service men and women to police the Bosnian peace agreement.

We all condemn the brutality perpetrated against innocent civilians in Bosnia, but President Clinton has yet to clearly explain to the American people what direct United States interest is at stake that warrants risking the lives of our servicemen and women. And, had none of our soldiers already arrived in Bosnia, I would stand here before you and argue that, without the full support of the American people behind sending United States troops to Bosnia, one lost life is one too many.

Let us not forget that, although the United States is attempting to be neutral as this peace goes forward, the United States was heavily involved in the NATO airstrikes that debilitated Serbian forces and led them to take a seat at the negotiating table. How can we be sure that American forces will not be targeted for retaliation by angry Serbians? Moreover, any attempt on our part to arm and train the Bosnian Moslems in preparation for our departure would directly contradict our spoken neutrality and put our troops at a much greater risk than that which they already face.

If our purpose in policing this peace agreement is to allow for the rebuilding of Bosnia, how can we put an arbitrary time limit of one year on United States occupation? This will accomplish little more than the unnecessary and unjustified loss of American lives, and could very well lead to a resumption of fighting once our troops are withdrawn. The ethnic and religious hatreds, in Bosnia have caused civil war and bloodshed for over 500 years. Ending this bloodshed would require an occupation force of unlimited duration, not merely 12 months. And, the argument that the war would spread to other parts of Europe without United States involvement does not carry much weight in my eyes, for how much has it spread over the past 4 years?

Congress has already voiced its overwhelming opposition to putting American ground troops in Bosnia by passing legislation that prohibits sending United States forces abroad unless Congress approves the appropriate funds for the operation.

However, the President has decided to send 20,000 servicemen and women to Bosnia over the objections of both Congress and the American people. We have a responsibility, a moral obligation, to support our Armed Forces in order to ensure that we in no way undermine their efforts but hopefully expedite their safe return home. We must offer unwavering support to the men and women of our United States forces, the greatest military in the world. Anything less on our part risks damaging the morale of our soldiers and, as we all know, strong unwavering morale is essential to unit coherence and success.

My colleagues, in closing, let me say that any of us can oppose the President's decision, as I most certainly do, but all of us must support the mission of our American forces.

□ 2045

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri, the Honorable IKE SKELTON, co-author of this amendment, who is well respected in this body.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it has been said the more emotion, the less reason. Emotion reigns. The cry is, stop the bloodshed. Fine. But it should be done right, not in a way that defies common sense and puts our troops at a high and unacceptable risk.

On November 11 I set forth eight conditions under which American forces could go to Bosnia. Two of those conditions have not been met by the U.S. policy.

One, there is no clear and understandable exit plan or policy. This gives me great concern that we could find ourselves stuck like flies stuck to flypaper. Second, the United States has formally guaranteed to arm and train the Bosnian Moslems. The United States has formally agreed to coordinate the arming and the training of these Moslem forces. This policy defies common sense, because it will cause U.S. troops to be viewed as favoring one side over the other. It will destroy our impartiality and puts our troops in danger.

The Americans will be seen as the enemy by the Serbs; the Moslems will expect a wink and a favor, and when they do not get it, they will be angry. This policy causes our troops to become targets of anger and vengeance. This policy of arming and training Bosnian Moslems, even though through a third party but guaranteed and supervised by us, concerns me.

There are three points to be considered. First, already there exists a parity between the warring factions, the Serbs on the one hand and the Croat-Moslem federation on the other. Note the recent battlefield successes by the federation.

Secondly, our allies and our military leaders in this country are not in favor of arming and training the Moslem forces. The French and British in particular are against it.

In order to have peacekeeping work, there must be trust. Trust of the former belligerents, of the impartiality of the peacekeepers. This trust and confidence will not exist so long as our government pursues the policy of supervising the arming and training of the Moslems. The U.S. field manual regarding peacekeeping states peacekeeping requires an impartial evenhanded approach. I have raised this issue with the President.

Mr. Speaker, we are sending our troops into Bosnia and putting them into an atmosphere of hostility. Serbian President Milosevic told the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. RAMSTAD] and the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. DANNER] the following: "Provisions to equip and train Bosnian Muslims are not part of the Dayton agreements. Such an effort would not be evenhanded and would be a mistake for the U.S." He went on to say, "I would ask the U.S. to reconsider the equip and train effort, as it will have no positive effect and be a waste of money. It will establish the wrong psychology in the area, preparing for war instead of preparing for peace."

Mr. Speaker, the only resolution before us to address this issue of the United States arming and training the Moslems is the Buyer-Skelton measure. It calls for the United States, in all respects, to be impartial. This present U.S. policy is placing our soldiers into the snake pit of the Balkans and angering half of the snakes. Our troops deserve to be put in an atmosphere that they expect, that of impartiality, as evenhanded peacekeepers; an atmosphere where all the warring sides will see the soldiers wearing American flags as truly impartial, where the warring sides will not see Americans as enemies and put targets on their backs.

Mr. Speaker, this policy is putting the American corporal, who is trying to settle a problem between a Serb soldier and a Moslem soldier, in an impossible and dangerous position. I urge a strong vote for the Buyer-Skelton measure.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, tonight this House faces a choice. We can choose to support the President of the United States in his decision to help end the tragic war in Bosnia, in his decision to act with our NATO allies to stop the killing in Europe for the third time in this century, in his decision to nurture a peace that, without question, will be fraught with its own risks and dangers. Or, we can choose to desert the President at this time of challenge to American leadership, to seek moral comfort for this country in the failure of Europeans to end the slaughter, to watch the war resume, content that the vital interests of the United States might, this time, escape the blight of war in Europe. As between a problematic peace and a horrific war, I choose to support the President's courageous work for peace.

Mr. Speaker, 10 days ago, in Sarajevo, with the gentleman from Indiana and 13 others, we encountered a moving scene outside the presidential palace in Sarajevo. The long-suffering people there, tears flowing from the eyes of an older woman who had lost her son in the war, pleaded with us that only America could solve this disaster. It was a poignant reminder that this is not a problem that can be solved by Europeans without American leadership.

At lunch the next day, with Army troopers in Germany, another poignant reminder, as I listened to one young Army Specialist who told me he had taken his Thanksgiving leave to visit Dachau. And he said, "Congressman, if this country has the power to prevent that from happening again, we must do what we can." Another reminder of an earlier problem that could not be solved by the Europeans without American leadership.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is important to remember that this is not just about Bosnia. Other actors around the world are watching these events and will be taking their cue. If leaders of dispossessed ethnic groups elsewhere in Europe and in the new states of the Soviet Union see the international community unable to act effectively here, they may well challenge the compromises that have been worked out in their states and, eventually, we may lose much of what we had won in the Cold War.

This President has shown courage for taking on this difficult responsibility in the face of political risks and public opposition. A vote for this resolution to oppose this mission will only serve to encourage both the enemies of peace in Bosnia and the enemies of United States leadership in the pursuit of a decent international order.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California. [Mr. GALLEGLY].

(Mr. GALLEGLY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of the Buyer-Skelton resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Buyer-Skelton resolution regarding the deployment of U.S. ground forces to Bosnia. I am concerned, however, that this resolution could provide a blank check for the further deployment of U.S. forces beyond the 20,000 we have been told are being sent.

It should come as no surprise to you that I share the strong skepticism and opposition of many of my Colleagues with respect to the commitment of United States ground forces to Bosnia. I voted for the Dornan resolution because I felt that the most emphatic way to express my opposition to the President's decision was to deny any funding for sending our troops to Bosnia before they actually began arriving in that country.

I believe the Buyer-Skelton resolution is acceptable because it does express our opposition to the President's decision while at the same time saying that the House will support the troops once they are deployed.

Even the Hamilton resolution can be acceptable because it goes directly to the issue of supporting our troops whether we agreed with the President or his decision or not.

I do not share our Commander in Chief's position. However, I do appreciate the dilemma he faces as a full partner in the NATO alliance and the responsibilities which come with that partnership.

While I agree with the President's claim that we have an interest in the future of Bosnia, I see absolutely no vital national security interest, domestic or military, being served by sending American troops into this hostile and volatile place.

Make no mistake, our troops, which will be heavily armed and expertly trained, are not going into Bosnia to keep the peace. They are going in to enforce the peace. And the act of enforcement often comes at a price. This deployment is especially dangerous because many Serbs will see our troops as being there, not as impartial arbiters, but as protectors of the Muslims.

Mr. Speaker we are at the point where the deployment of U.S. ground forces is a fait accompli. Nevertheless, it is our duty to the citizens of this nation to express our views on this matter and my view is that we should not be sending our troops to Bosnia.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

(Mr. DORNAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of my friends, the gentleman from Missouri, IKE SKELTON, and the gentleman from Indiana, Major BUYER. And for me, obviously, I support the troops and I will be there with them at Christmas. Join me.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI] who accompanied me on a trip to the Balkans.

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution very clearly, because it does clearly state our opposition to the policy that has brought us here today.

This is a policy which began with an unfair, uneven arms embargo that left a people crippled, at war. It continued with a policy that reneged on the threats of air strikes to stop an aggressor waging war against civilians, and it has become a policy that allows the most vicious of war criminals to remain in the region with our troops in harm's way.

Nevertheless, despite Congress' prior stands against this policy, our troops will be in the region within a week. So tonight we are not only reiterating our opposition to that flawed policy that brought us here; we are also saying to our troops, Godspeed with your mission. It is a terrible policy, but it is a noble mission that may bring peace to a region that has not known peace and hope to a people afraid now to hope.

But, Mr. President, we are also saying in this resolution that we will be watching to make certain that everything possible is being done to ensure the safety of our troops and to see that the civilian side of rebuilding stays on course. So, you see, since there is nothing Congress can do to change the President's course, I think we have an obligation to make sure that our troops are not caught in the middle of two wars, one in Bosnia and one in Washington; and I believe that the Buyer resolution, as opposed to the other resolutions, fulfills that.

Last and most importantly, this resolution clearly states to our troops that regardless of our position on policy or on mission, that we are with them; that we are proud of them; that we are cheering for them; and that we are praying for them.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. POSHARD].

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I had three serious questions I needed answered when I went to the Balkans 2 weeks ago. Do the people, including the leadership of Bosnia, Serbia, and Croatia, really want peace? Has our military mission been planned to minimize every possible risk to our men and women who are going there? And is this mission, this policy, the right thing for America?

I felt strongly the first two questions were answered affirmatively, but it is the third question, the question of policy, which I want to address. And it was on the streets of Sarajevo that the rightness of this policy became clear to me.

A crowd gathered around us in the street in front of the President's office; an elderly lady in tears, pouring out her heart, was telling us of her whole family being killed, of the babies in the building where she lived being killed by mortars.

In the anguish of an elderly man, standing not far from her, came these words. He said, "Do you not understand that only America can ensure the peace? Only if America comes will we have peace. We trust America."

Mr. Speaker, I was an 18-year-old kid in Korea, 32 years ago, 12 years after

the war, with the First Cav Division keeping the peace in Korea. I remember walking around the streets of Munsani and Yongigo, and the Korean people coming up to us and saying, "Thank you for being here. If not for America, we would have no peace." I remember understanding very clearly then what America meant to people who want peace and freedom.

For the past 32 years, I have intellectualized the role of America in the world. I voted on authorizations and appropriations for foreign policy and military policy, but not until the streets of Sarajevo was I reminded again of what America means to people who are without hope.

Why did they say that only America can ensure the peace? Why did they say, standing there in the midst of ruins, knowing that 250,000 of their people were killed, that 2 million were homeless, why did they say they trust America?

What do they trust? Our superior military forces? Yes. Our leadership of the free world? Yes. Our democratic institutions? Yes. But more than that, they trust the experience of America. They trust the history of America, which no other country can match.

Look around this Chamber. We have come to this country from every nation in the world, from every background, every ethnic, every religious, every racial background.

□ 2100

And we have shown the world that we can live together in brotherhood, tolerating our differences and finding common ground, rather than battlegrounds, upon which to build.

We have chosen to live together, to overcome our differences, and they know that. If we, among all nations, cannot send one division among all the divisions we have in Europe to Bosnia to enforce a peace, to give people a chance to live again with one another, then what Nation will stand in our stead? What nation will give others the hope that only America can give?

If we think people, given the chance in Sarajevo, cannot live together in peace and overcome the forces of hate which inflame passions of ethnic and religious pride, then I tell my colleagues, look at Belfast, look at the Middle East. We cannot go to Sarajevo and fail to understand the faith that people have in the experiment and the experience that is America.

Mr. Speaker, the tears of that grandmother on the streets of Sarajevo are the tears of every grandmother for all time who has lost her son or daughter to wars of injustice. But they are only, in part, tears of regret. They are also tears of hope that at some time in the future someone else's grandson or granddaughter will be walking down the streets of Sarajevo glad that years ago America came and peace came with her. Oppose this resolution.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to respond to the last

speaker. I would say that foreign policy must be guided by our heads, not our hearts.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS] in the spirit of bipartisanship that brings the Buyer-Skelton amendment.

(Mr. EVANS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I oppose sending ground troops to Bosnia and support this resolution and hope that my colleagues will also.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the decision to send ground forces to Bosnia because it will put our soldiers in the middle of an ethnic powderkeg that could explode again at any moment.

Neither the Dayton Agreement nor military force can erase the centuries of ethnic unrest and dissension that has fueled this conflict. This hatred will not cease. Even as the warring parties prepare for the implementation of the agreement, different factions have burned and looted property that will be turned back to their opponents. Can we expect the peace to last considering this level of animosity or the history of the region?

This leads me to believe that this agreement will unravel. If it does, our soldiers will be in the middle of the conflict. But even if it does last, this operation is a risky proposition. Our soldiers will face the dangers posed by some 6 million landmines, many of them scattered indiscriminately throughout the unforgiving terrain of the region. And numerous armed terrorist groups, who may not be easily controlled by the signers of the agreement, may attack our forces for their own political gains.

Considering the history of the region and the many threats our soldiers face, I cannot support this mission. I urge my colleagues to vote for the resolution.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute and 20 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER].

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Speaker, I was told today that the reason the President is sending troops to Bosnia is to "break the cycle of violence." This, alone, is not an acceptable reason to risk the lives of young Americans.

Four conditions must be met before we commit United States ground troops anywhere: First, there must be a vital national interest at stake. Mr. Speaker, there is no vital national interest at stake in Bosnia. Second, there must be a clear mission and a reasonable chance of success. Mr. Speaker, there is no clear mission and no reasonable chance of success. Third, there must be a clear exit strategy. Mr. Speaker, a time line to withdraw before the next election is not an exit strategy.

Fourth, and most importantly, we must have the support of the American people, whose husbands, wives, sons, and daughters are asked to sacrifice their lives to achieve the mission.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the debate this evening and I have heard not one member of Congress even pretend that the American people support this deployment.

During this season of peace on earth and good will towards men, I can understand the desire to bring peace to a



war torn nation. However, Mr. Speaker, I have two sons in their twenties and a daughter who just turned 18. I would not send them to die in the snows of Bosnia in support of this policy, and therefore I cannot, in good conscience, support asking other parents to do so.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

(Ms. HARMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, like the majority of my colleagues, I wish that our Bosnia policy had been focused and clear 4 years ago, before a quarter of a million people died and 3 million more became refugees.

Mr. Speaker, two presidents hesitated and the results were an arms embargo that ratified arms imbalance, a hobbled U.N., and a belated bombing campaign. Another Holocaust was occurring, but the world held back.

Time and again the Congress warned the President, and I did too. "Lift the arms embargo," we said. "Do not make a commitment of troops a precondition to peace," we said, but he chose otherwise. Now, the options are fewer, but I am clear on what course is morally correct. We must support peace.

The Dayton accord, though far from perfect, is the last option for peace in an exhausted region. I too was there last weekend and Sarajevo broke my heart. I gave my word to General Bill Crouch, Commander of the U.S. Army in Europe, to Admiral Layton "Snuffy" Smith, Commander of the NATO operation, and to Corporal Patricia Villa, Sergeant Marie LaRue, and Private First Class Don Bradley, all of California, that I would vote to support them.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot vote for a resolution that sends a confused message. I cannot vote for a resolution that prevents a separate effort to achieve military parity so the future aggression will be deterred.

I would prefer a more just peace, but it is not available. This is the peace we can achieve, and it is unpardonable to let it pass by.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY].

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am directing this to those Americans who are watching. I want to clear up what this debate is about. Is it about America's leadership? Absolutely not. Our leadership brought the warring factions of this evil war to Dayton in an attempt to resolve their differences, but diplomacy does not include sending American troops.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman must address his remarks to the Chair, and not to people watching on television. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, diplomacy does not include sending American troops—our finest men and women—

into danger. Deployment of troops relates to national security and I don't believe a national security risk exists in the Balkans.

To be the leader of the free world does not require our troops to face a brutal winter in a war zone that is littered with as many as 6 million land mines.

Is it about supporting our troops—NO. I will not, nor should one Member of this Congress, allow our troops to be left to hang out to dry. I will fight to ensure that we have no more tragedies like Somalia.

This deployment is a 2-year-old promise that the administration made, and I believe it has made our troops a bargaining chip in the negotiations.

I oppose sending Americans to Bosnia and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, if NATO had acted and punished Serbian aggression when it first occurred 4 years ago, we would not be here tonight; the West would not have repeated the mistakes of Munich; and, more than 200,000 people would not have died.

After almost 4 years of NATO drift, Croatian military success and NATO bombing of Serbian forces have enabled the Clinton administration to stop the killing and negotiate a peace. I steadfastly opposed the use of American ground forces there during the wartime situation, but our troops and our allies' troops are now going to police a peace.

Mr. Speaker, if they go under the Buyer approach, we will be sending a signal of uncertainty that will in my view increase the risk of attack on our troops by those who read congressional opposition as a signal that if they just kill a few Americans, we will pull the plug, just as we did in Somalia.

If my colleagues vote for Buyer, it seems to me they logically should have voted for Dornan in order to prevent the financing of the operation in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to lay down that uncertain trumpet and pass the Hamilton amendment clean without Buyer. Send a clear message that we will leave no doubt about the strength of our resolve.

Mr. Speaker, but by the grace of God, our souls at birth could have been infused into a body born in Bosnia rather than one born on American soil. Only an accident of birth makes us lucky enough to live out our lives as Americans.

Now our troops are going to make peace, not war in an act of mercy toward many of our fellow human beings on this globe. Do our duty tonight. It may not be popular, but it will be right and it will make our troops safer.

Support Hamilton clean, defeat Buyer. That is the best way to help our troops.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the

gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK].

(Mr. BROWNBACK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Buyer bill, supporting the troops, opposing the President's policy.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BLUTE].

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Speaker, we all have concerns and trepidations about the President's ill-defined policy in that war-torn part of the world. But we have had two votes in this House that sent an unequivocal message on where we stand on that issue.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me tonight we are way beyond that now, and for those of us who believe that the President has the constitutional authority to deploy these troops, and who oppose the War Powers Act as unconstitutional and abrogating the President's power, we must support the Buyer-Skelton resolution.

We must recognize that as we speak tonight, the planes are landing, the troops are on the ground, and many thousands more are en route. Young Americans in harm's way. Regardless of our criticism of this policy, it is time tonight to rally behind our troops and send them and any potential adversary, the message that we stand behind them 100 percent and the Congress of the United States is behind them in their mission.

Vote for Buyer-Skelton and vote for our young men and women in Bosnia.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER].

(Mr. OLVER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, for 4 years, Americans have seen in CNN detail the concentration camps and the ethnic cleansing and the systematic slaughter of civilians. Who dares forget the mass slaughter of the males in Srebrenica, thousands of men and boys, when that U.S.-designated safe haven, swelled with refugees, was overrun by the Bosnia Serbs, all because the United Nations proved that it could not and would not stop the genocide.

Events have shown that the United States is the only power in the world that can stop such crimes. To secure peace, President Clinton has courageously put himself and America's conscience on the line. America led NATO to stop the war, America led the negotiations for peace, and now America must lead NATO in securing the peace so that wounds can heal and justice can evolve.

The United States wields such power morally as well as militarily because of how the world perceives us. As has been eloquently written, America is seen as a "good and tolerant country; a country that leaves people alone, but does not leave evil alone; a country



that will find the courage to act where the courage to act is wanting. We are not the world's policeman, but we are not the world's innocent bystander. To do nothing about Bosnia would steal the meaning from the American victory in the cold war."

In the year that NATO will be in Bosnia, boundaries will be secured, warring factions separated, and 2 million refugees who want to return to their homes will be secured in their return.

Those are NATO's purposes. But the purpose of America's presence and participation with NATO is stability in Europe and peace in Bosnia to give Bosnia the opportunity to become again the multireligious, multicultural society that this tragic manufactured war was designed to destroy.

Mr. Speaker, there was a wonderful photo in the New York Times this past Sunday. Mr. Speaker, 3,000 Sarajevans, Bosnians of Catholic and Moslem and Orthodox faith, demonstrating in unity to show that after all the suffering and horror of 4 years, the idea of a multiethnic, multireligious Bosnia has survived.

The ultimate test for peace is whether Bosnians will use wisely the opportunity provided by the 1-year NATO mission to grow those 3,000 to 30,000 to 300,000 and beyond in rebuilding Bosnia. This is our time to act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the Buyer resolution and to pass the Hamilton resolution.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] has 18 minutes and 10 seconds, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] has 12½ minutes.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER].

(Mrs. FOWLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Buyer-Skelton resolution.

I have long opposed the deployment of United States troops to Bosnia. I have twice voted against such a deployment, and have written the President, urging him not to send troops.

I believe that our Nation's interests in Bosnia are important. I have supported the involvement of our sea and air forces, our intelligence and logistics assets, and our most diligent diplomatic efforts. But I have never felt our interests were so vital that they warranted putting our ground troops at risk.

Accordingly, I voted for the Dornan measure to oppose the provision of funds to carry out this mission.

However, while I supported the Dornan legislation, I recognize that the President will disregard it. Thus, I will also vote for the Buyer-Skelton resolution. If our troops are going to go—and there is no doubt that they will—the

first are already there they should be certain of our commitment to ensure they have every resource necessary to accomplish their mission.

I urge the House to support this measure.

□ 2115

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], chairman of the Committee on National Security.

(Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I have heard Members say on the floor this evening that we should support peace. When I think back, we have supported peace all over this world in recent times. We supported peace in Lebanon, in Somalia. We had people killed in both places because of it. We withdrew.

It is easy for Members to get up here and say that they have concern for people who are being killed in other places throughout the world. Somehow or another they divorce that from the killing of our own people in the process. Mr. Speaker, I do not represent those people in Bosnia. I represent people back here. The lives of our people are more important than the others. It just comes down to that.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT].

(Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Buyer-Skelton resolution.

Bosnia, a name, that up until a few years ago, was rarely mentioned on the House floor, and most of us probably couldn't have found it on a map. Yet, today, U.S. troops are going there to help make sure it continues to exist because it has suddenly become in our national security interest to do so.

None of use who've searched our hearts can say that there haven't been crimes against humanity in Bosnia. None of us want to see those crimes ever happen again.

The President has decided that committing the United States and our NATO allies will put a stop to the slaughter of innocent Bosnians. Perhaps, but for how long?

However, when committing a democratic government, such as ours, to a policy, Congress too has to show a commitment. In the last Congress, we urged the President to lift the arms embargo. In this Congress, we've told the President on several occasions not to send ground troops unless he gets our approval first. Yet, the President took no action on the embargo and ignored us regarding the troops.

We're being asked now to support this policy because the troops are on their way to Bosnia.

This begs the question: Can we support the troops knowing that the policy they, and we, are being asked to uphold is wrong? Can a civil war that has been raging for centuries be cured by a 1-year stay of foreign forces?

The White House has claimed the President is showing leadership, that as the leader of

NATO we, as a nation, must also show leadership, that as the only remaining world's superpower, we must show leadership.

But, is being lead into a swamp with no clear path out leadership? Will NATO remain intact when this policy fails? Will the world question our leadership even more when we pull out and Bosnia resumes its bloody civil and ethnic war?

Our troops could end up paying the price of our leadership with their lives. Our troops must understand that we will support them, as we've always done, but that we have no confidence in the President's policy that put them there. This message must be made crystal clear to the President and our troops.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Montgomery], a very respected Member of this institution.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bipartisan Buyer-Skelton resolution that expresses opposition to the President's policy to deploy 20,000 members of the United States Armed Forces to Bosnia.

Mr. Speaker, I do not support putting American forces on the ground but since the deployment has begun, I agree with the Buyer provisions that say that the President and Secretary of Defense shall rely on the judgment of the United States commander in Bosnia.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, makes it very clear that despite our opposition to the President's mission, we stand behind the brave men and women who serve in Bosnia and, also, God bless these great Americans.

I point out to this group tonight, they are all volunteers and they are serving under the American flag.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. Levin].

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, if I might, let me share what I learned in Bosnia. First, Dayton is a declaration of peace, not war. Second, there are serious self-interests on the part of all the three parties. The Dayton agreement was reached but not primarily made in America. For each of those parties, there is a clear self-interest.

Third, the U.S. military is supported. As one general said to us, we can do the job. It is a task defined, limited and achievable, and they have authority to take whatever force is necessary to protect our troops.

If Members vote to reject Dayton, what they are saying is not only no to the Commander in Chief but no to the military leadership of our nation. They helped draft this plan.

There is some risk in peace. There is also risk in renewed war, the risk of a renewed war in Europe spilling over beyond Bosnia and the renewed risk of genocide.

I would like to say to my friend from Indiana, yes, we have to make policy with our heads, hard-headed ways.

Americans also have a heart, and the prospect of renewed genocide is something that should not be ignored.

Finally, I want to say there is an exit strategy. It is very clear. If the parties who have chosen peace continue on that path, we will help them. If they choose to renew war, we are going to get out and get out fast.

I urge support of Hamilton and that we vote against Buyer.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LONGLEY] a comrade of mine from the Gulf war.

(Mr. LONGLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the President's policies and in support of the troops.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST].

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Buyer-Skelton resolution. This is not a Tonkin Gulf resolution. The situation we are debating here is not about Beirut. It is not about Somalia. It is not about Haiti.

There are risks in this policy of our intervention. There are profound unknowns. Does the military, and this is the question we need to ask, have the force necessary to meet those risks, to meet those unknowns? We want to make sure that they do. Is there a chance in this situation for a profound change in a positive way in this world as a result of our efforts? The answer should be yes, can be yes, must be yes.

The policy up to this point, in my judgment, has been haphazard and indecisive. The Buyer-Skelton resolution allows us from this point on to be decisive, clear. And as we go through this dark tunnel together, let us all hold this torch high to light the way and chase away the demons.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, tonight we are at a very important point in the history of the United States of America, the point that many would not have chosen to come upon. But now is that moment and we must involve ourselves. Why?

Mr. Speaker, yesterday in this Chamber, Shimon Peres, Israel's prime minister, appealed for American leadership in the world. Today, as we debate the appropriate use of American power in bringing an end to 4 years of bloodshed and suffering in Bosnia, we would do well to remember the prime minister's words. "You cannot escape that which America alone can do," he said. "America alone can keep the world free . . ."

We are, as is frequently observed, the world's only superpower. We possess a potent combination of military and moral authority. But possession is not enough: we must also exercise our authority when the occasion demands it. This administration has done that.

American leadership brought the warring parties to the peace table, and American leadership must ensure that this peace process survives. Failure to lead would guarantee the continuation—even the expansion of bloodshed. It would endanger the future of NATO, an organization that has brought nearly four decades of peace to Europe.

But perhaps worst, failure to lead would undercut our reputation for steadfastness in the pursuit of peace throughout the world. It would signal that we shrink from our responsibilities, instead of shouldering the burdens that accompany leadership.

We must demand more of ourselves. As President Clinton said, "We cannot stop all war for all time; but we can stop some wars. We cannot save all women and all children; but we can save many of them. We can't do everything; but we must do what we can."

In the three wars that shaped this century—World War I, World War II, and the cold war—America achieved victory because we were willing to exercise leadership. Now we have another opportunity to lead—this time to shape the peace that will govern the next century. I urge my colleagues to shoulder this responsibility and seize this opportunity. I will oppose the Buyer resolution which does not support this opportunity to preserve a lasting peace. I urge my colleagues to support the Hamilton resolution and ensure that peace will remain in Bosnia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky). The Chair would advise that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] has 14 minutes and 10 seconds remaining, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX].

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Buyer-Skelton resolution which recognizes the fact that the American public still has reservations about the President's policy in Bosnia but wholeheartedly supports our troops who are there. There are serious reservations about what the precise mission of our forces is, what are the specific rules of engagement, what will happen when NATO forces leave and what is our national interest there. While questions remain regarding these questions I have raised, we support our troops, our sons and daughters that have been sent to Bosnia. We completely back them to make sure that they have equipment, the resources and tools that they need. We need to make sure we protect them so that the mission will be speedily and successfully handled.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I hope and pray that we will soon see a permanent end to the hostilities and atrocities, relief for the war's victims, justice at the war crimes tribunal, and the safe and speedy return of our brave soldiers. Support Buyer-Skelton.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM], former naval commander.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in very strong support of the Buyer resolution. I think it is very clear, despite the opposition of many of us, that the President is going to put the troops in Bosnia and that the votes today are not here to avoid that happening.

I want to join with my colleagues in supporting our men and women in uniform over there. I believe while they are there we owe them that obligation. But that in no measure means that I, nor many of you, believe they should be there. It is a very dangerous and I think highly inappropriate use of military force. It is dangerous because our troops on the ground in Bosnia are going to be the subject and targets of radical Moslem terrorists who have another agenda, and it is inappropriate because there is no vital United States military interest there.

We cannot afford to be the policemen of the world. And there is no realistic expectation that when our troops leave, there will not be a resumption of the civil war over there. I believe in supporting our men and women, but I simply cannot condone nor support the operation that is going on over there. I think the Buyer resolution strikes the right balance under the circumstances tonight. I strongly support it.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], prospective and former Army sergeant.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, observation. Our troops are going and there is nothing we are going to be able to do about it. One of the things that concerns me is that we do not profit from history.

We went into Beirut and we lost 241 Marines blown all to heck, trying to solve their problems that are of an age-old nature. We went into Somalia and got involved in a civil conflict there and guys driving around on pickup trucks with machine guns in the back drove us out of there. Aided, the tyrant, the tribal leader, is still in power over there and we spent hundreds of millions of dollars. And we pulled out and we did not solve that problem.

And now we are going into a quagmire much greater than either one of those, believing that we are going to solve those problems. We are not going to solve those problems. A year from now we will probably pull out and the war will go on and people will continue to die and we will have lost a lot of young men and women unnecessarily.

So tonight all I want to say, because this is a fait accompli, is God bless those soldiers and God bless their parents and loved ones.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LAHOOD].

(Mr. LAHOOD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LaHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on the president's plan to deploy United States troops to Bosnia.

While I am opposed to sending troops to enforce a fragile peace in a region plagued by war and mired in ethnic conflict, I do want to be clear that I am fully supportive of the troops that will be on the ground.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the troops on the ground need and deserve our full support, so that as they head into harm's way they will have the assurance that the thoughts of those at home are with them.

Offering support for the troops, however, does not mean that Congress has no role in the troop deployment or is relinquishing its role in the area of foreign policy.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would also like to mention that my constituent, Sgt. Mathew Chipman, of Beardstown, IL, was one of the first army personnel to set foot on Bosnian soil.

His picture was in the front page of every newspaper in the country.

Sgt. Chipman is a long time veteran of the army with many years of service. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of Sgt. Chipman and his family. He will be in our thoughts and prayers.

Indeed, Congress does have a role in foreign policy. At the very least. It is incumbent on the President to come before both Houses of Congress and present his plan on deploying troops to the former Yugoslavia, as well as his plan defining the mission and exit strategy for those troops.

Historically, before committing large numbers of U.S. troops to crisis areas overseas, it has been customary for the President to seek the consent of Congress before initiating a deployment of military forces.

In this case, the President has not sought approval of Congress for his actions, yet, the President intends to fly to Paris today for the purpose of signing a treaty that will obligate over 20,000 troops for operations in Bosnia.

If the President, with or without Congressional approval, intends to place American troops in harm's way—and it appears that this is what he intends to do—then I urge the President, in consultation with Congress, to articulate a clear mission statement and to define an achievable exit strategy.

Our troops on the ground need to know precisely what it is that they are being asked to do—and Congress deserves a role in making that determination.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. CHAMBLISS], a member of the Committee on National Security.

(Mr. CHAMBLISS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, this has been a very difficult decision that we have had to deal with, the deployment of troops to Bosnia. I, along with the gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. SKELTON], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER], have sat in the Committee on National Security over the last several weeks and we have asked very serious questions of the administration.

Those are the same questions that have been alluded to by Mr. SKELTON earlier. Those questions simply have not been answered. I voted in favor of the Dornan amendment earlier. That vote by me in favor of the Dornan amendment was a statement. It was a statement that, Mr. President, you have not provided the information satisfactory to this Congress to authorize this Congress to vote in favor of deploying troops to Bosnia.

□ 2130

In spite of that, that decision has been made. That decision is behind us now, as the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. BURTON], just said. It is time now to move on. When we move on, we must leave this House, leaving nothing unturned, but giving our unconditional support to the troops, the brave men and women in Bosnia. The Buyer-Skelton resolution does that. I urge support of that resolution.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago when the reality of the holocaust came to light, people of conscience said never again to ethnic cleansing and to genocide. These abhorrent actions have continued despite this promise. I believe that the world can no longer turn a blind eye to Bosnia and the tragedies that are there. That is why I commend President Clinton for his leadership, support the troops for their courage, and will support the Hamilton amendment.

I rise in opposition to the resolution on the floor at this time, because I believe our country can be proud of the leadership in bringing the warring parties to the conflict in Bosnia to the negotiating table and for the successful conclusion of the Bosnian peace talks. Now we should join with other nations in ensuring that the peace agreement can be implemented.

Mr. Speaker, the United States does have a national interest in peace in the former Yugoslavia. As the world's lone superpower, we have the obligation to lead. Several hundred thousand innocent children, men and women have died in the conflict in Bosnia. The war must stop.

At stake if the United States does not participate in the Bosnian peace process are the role of the United States as a world leader, the future viability of NATO, and the risk of reigniting the conflagration in Bosnia. A continuing Bosnian conflict threatens to spread killing and destruction to other European states. The terrible acts of ethnic cleansing and brutal atrocities challenge the conscience of us all.

Is the Bosnian mission without danger and risk? No. With strong leadership, there are always risks. These risks have been minimized, and they are risks for peace, risks for ending

years of bloodshed, risks for freedom. We risk far more by failing to act. We risk far more if we allow the tenuous peace to collapse and watch the flames of war ignite again.

For this reason I oppose this resolution, urge support of the Hamilton resolution, and commend President Clinton for this leadership.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] for the perspective of a former Army infantry first lieutenant.

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I think we need to have a summary of what the Buyer-Skelton resolution really does for I think it is being lost in some of the rhetoric here. It has two parts.

First is a reiteration of votes that the House has already taken on October 30 and November 17. The second is a policy statement which I think all Members should be able to support. First of all, it is an expression of confidence, pride and admiration in members of the U.S. armed services.

Second, it reinforces the need to respect the judgment of the military leadership in the field. After Somalia, that kind of debacle suggests this kind of policy advice from the Congress is essential.

Third, it reinforces the policy that proper weaponry and logistical support must be provided to our troops in the field. Again, after the Somalia debacle, that kind of advice from the Congress is entirely essential and appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, there is no vital interest for the United States in Bosnia. I very much approve of the Buyer-Skelton resolution, and ask all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

(Mr. NADLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Hamilton resolution as one who has spoken out for the last 4 years urging that we do the one thing that would enable the people of Bosnia to defend themselves against organized aggression, violence, rape, torture and genocide; lift the arms embargo. This was not done. Tragically, the war and the mass murders continued.

By maintaining the arms embargo, which prevented the Bosnians from defending themselves against aggression and genocide, we incurred a heavy moral burden. We now have one final chance to meet that burden, to end the killing, to stop the genocide, and to restore peace. Let us meet the obligation we incurred, least it be said the United States did nothing to stop the genocide. Let us give peace a chance, let us support the President, let us support the Hamilton resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky). The gentleman

from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] has 8½ minutes remaining and the right to close, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAUGHLIN] a present colonel in the U.S. Army Reserve.

(Mr. LAUGHLIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I supported the Dornan amendment because I believe the President of the United States, our Commander-in-Chief, has not given us the vital national interest reasons to put our troops in Bosnia.

On the very day President Kennedy stopped the Russian troops off the coast of Cuba, many of my classmates and I signed our contracts to be members of the U.S. Army. History proved President Kennedy right.

Later my three brothers and I volunteered during the Vietnam era. All three of my brothers went to Vietnam. I was sent elsewhere. History proved us wrong when we believed vital national interests were involved there.

Later I supported the Persian Gulf war. History proved us right on vital national interests there.

Today we are asking young men and women of America to become targets of opportunity for a civil war in Bosnia, and history will provide those of us who oppose this policy right. The President of the United States, our Commander-in-Chief, has not demonstrated any vital national interest for the brave young men and women who have risked their lives in defense of freedom to go to Bosnia. I ask support of the Buyer-Skelton resolution.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCHALE] a comrade of mine from the Persian Gulf war, for the perspective of a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps.

Mr. MCHALE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Buyer-Skelton resolution. As I have listened to the oppositions voiced by many of my good friends and colleagues, I have to wonder whether they have read the resolution. In fact, there are two elements, Mr. Speaker, contained in this resolution.

The first element is one of opposition to the policy. The simple fact of the matter is the vast majority of the Members of the House opposed the decision to deploy. But the second element is far more important. Let me speak with passion on that issue. A few days ago I watched an interview on CNN of a lieutenant colonel named Bronco Lane, and he said whatever people think of the mission, he urged support for his men, for his soldiers.

We are a good and powerful Nation, and whatever may divide us in the House this evening, the message we communicate to Colonel Lane and to those who might inflict harm upon his

soldiers is that once Americans go to war, we come together as a Nation. The resources necessary to accomplish the mission, those requested by the field commander, will be provided. Those are the elements of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge strong support for our soldiers. I urge an affirmative vote on the Buyer-Skelton resolution.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT].

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of the Buyer-Skelton resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Buyer-Skelton resolution. The President has developed a policy committing our troops without the consultation of Congress or the consent of the American people. Young men like Kempty Watson and Todd Beeson, both from Arkansas City, KS, have been required to go above and beyond the call of duty.

Mr. Watson and Mr. Beeson, are not defending the border of this great country. Nor are they being required to defend the Constitution of the United States of America. There is no vital American interest in Bosnia. This mission is truly above and beyond the call of duty. They are heroes, as is every American who served in Bosnia. They serve regardless of the policy.

Watson, Beeson, and others, like those men and women who serve in the 1st Armored Division, follow the Commander in Chief and do so professionally like no others in the world.

This resolution supports all our fine men and women in the U.S. Armed Forces, 100 percent.

But this resolution also strongly opposed the policy the President has forced on the American public.

Mr. Speaker, I disapprove of the President's policy. There are many ways to lead the world, lead NATO, present peace, without putting our troops in harm's way.

Therefore I support the Buyer-Skelton resolution and our troops.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA].

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to make a play on words with the issue that is now before this body. Mr. Speaker, I was moved by the remarks earlier made by the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM]. We share a similar sense of anger and frustration in our experiences as Vietnam veterans, although I was not a war hero like my good friend from California. But all I know is that we could have been among the 58,000 dead soldiers and sailors whose names are honored at the Vietnam Memorial.

Mr. Speaker, our problem with Vietnam, Lebanon, and Somalia was not because we did not have the resources to protect and sustain our troops. It was because of poor military planning and execution by both our civilian and military leaders here in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I hope to God we will not have another Secretary of Defense

make a confession to the world and to the American people that it was wrong for us to be in Vietnam. I consider it an insult to the names of every soldier who died in Vietnam to tell that to the faces of the parents and relatives of those who died there in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious the Dayton agreement is not perfect. Our President has spoken well, given leadership. I ask that we sustain the Hamilton resolution with caution, as expressed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to make a play on words with the issue that is now before this body.

I believe it is appropriate that Congress fulfill its constitutional responsibility by deliberating the merits of the resolution now before us.

Mr. Speaker, I was moved by the remarks expressed earlier by the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM]. We share a similar sense of anger and frustration in our experiences as Vietnam veterans, although I was not a war hero like my friend from California. But all I know is that we could have been among the 58,000 dead soldiers and sailors whose names are honored at the Vietnam Memorial.

Mr. Speaker, our problems with Vietnam, Lebanon, and Somalia was not because we did not have the resources to protect and sustain our troops.—It was because of poor military planning and execution by both our civilian and military leaders here in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I hope to God we will not have another Secretary of Defense make a confession to the world and the American people—and that is after the fact, that the United States was wrong to be in Vietnam. I consider it an insult to the names of every soldier who died in Vietnam. Perhaps former Secretary McNamara should tell that to the faces of the parents and relatives of those brave soldiers who gave their lives because of misguided policies that our political leaders dreamed up here in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the Dayton agreement is not a perfect document, and I sincerely hope our President will not be blinded by the concerns appropriately addressed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHELTON].

Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious that our President is not running an opinion poll or is trying to compete in a popularity contest. I commend our President for his global leadership on this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support the Hamilton resolution, but to recognize also the concerns raised earlier by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHELTON].

Mr. Speaker, without United States leadership and participation, no peace is possible in Bosnia.

For nearly 4 years, a horrifying war has torn Bosnia apart. The world has witnessed the murder of 250,000 innocent men, women, and children there, while over 2 million people have been forced from their homes and made refugees.

Yesterday, like many other members, I was deeply touched by Israeli Prime Minister Shimon Peres' address before Congress. Prime Minister Peres noted the United States has saved the world

from three of its greatest menaces: German Nazism, Japanese Militarism, and Soviet communism.

In honoring America, Prime Minister Peres stated, "You did it. You brought freedom. You defended it. Even in this very day, as Bosnia reels in agony, you offered a compass and a lamp to a confused situation like in the Middle East. Nobody else was able or ready to do it. You enabled many nations to save their democracies even as you strive now to assist nations to free themselves from their nondemocratic past."

"America," stated Prime Minister Peres, "In my judgment, cannot escape what history has laid on your shoulders, on the shoulders of each and every one of you. You cannot escape that which America can alone do. America alone can keep the world free and assist nations to assume the responsibility for their own fate."

Mr. Speaker, Prime Minister Peres has it right. Throughout history, America has always stood for peace and freedom and what is right. In Bosnia, we and our allies are not going to fight a war, but to protect a peace.

Without American Leadership, there would be no peace agreement. Without American troop participation, this peace agreement will not be carried out. As the leader of the free world, America cannot shirk its responsibility to end the suffering in Bosnia, to stop the spread of war to Europe, and to ensure a lasting peace.

The President has committed the United States to the Bosnia mission. As former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger recently stated, "I now believe that if we do not honor the President's words, the threat to our security would be greater because nobody would believe that we are capable of conducting a serious foreign policy."

Mr. Speaker, with American leadership and credibility on the line, we cannot just cut and run from our duty to lead. It is time that we support our President and our troops in providing light and hope to this dark part of the world.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], the gentleman who has served as the conscience of this Congress on the carnage in Bosnia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky). The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, in August 1990, Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait. The President, a few days later, determined that he would deploy troops to oppose aggression in the Persian gulf, and we as a Nation and as a Congress were united in that deployment. That deployment occurred during August, September, October, November, and December, and over 400,000 troops were sent. The Democratic leadership and the Republican leadership stood together in support of that deployment to oppose aggression.

We did so as a united nation. Yes; there was a vote in January as to whether to go to war, and in a bipartisan vote we determined that the President would have the authority to do so. The President acted, and the Congress shortly thereafter, some few days, passed a resolution, with over 400 of us voting to support the troops and their success.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is in our national interest to participate in the effort in Bosnia for several reasons. First, our President has told our allies and the warring parties that we would do so. America's credibility and our leadership in the world would be severely undermined if we do not.

The risk for peace is one that the Western alliance and the United States should be willing to take now and in the future. The NATO alliance under United States leadership remains, my colleagues, the stabilizing force in Europe, and it must be kept ready, united, and maintain its will to deter aggression and establish peace.

I suggest to you, my friends, it would be immoral to stand by in the face of the carnage and the rape and the murder and the genocide and the tragedy that is Bosnia.

My colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle, my fellow Americans, if you will, President George Bush recently stated:

It is in our national interest to maintain the integrity of the United States; credibility in the world. If the President shifts direction now or if it is seen that the President does not have the support of Congress, our standing as leader of the free world and the standing of NATO would be dramatically diminished.

President Bush concluded his remarks by saying "That must not happen."

I will oppose the Buyer-Skelton resolution. They are men of integrity, and they serve their people well. But I am not opposed to the President's policy. It is not my policy. I wanted to lift the arms embargo. I wanted to give to the Bosnian people the right and the ability to defend their homes. I think President Bush and President Clinton were wrong in not supporting that policy. But the issue today is that the President has chosen a policy, and it is not Somalia, where there was no agreement among the warring parties, it is not Lebanon, where there was no agreement among the factions. It is a place in this world where parties brought together by the President of the United States have agreed on peace.

□ 2145

I believe it is worth a risk for peace. I hope many of my colleagues were here yesterday. Shimon Peres spoke to a joint session of Congress. He said to us, as a country, that we saved freedom. He went on to say that wars did not cause us to lose heart, triumphs did not corrupt us, and we remained unspoiled because we rejected the spoils of victory.

He then talked about the risks for peace taken by his friend Yitzhak Rabin and his country, and he observed that just a few years ago he could not have conceived of reaching out to Yasser Arafat, a Palestinian, his enemy of centuries. Not the Arab and the Jews. For centuries. And now he believes there is a chance for peace, and he said that it was worth risking peace because it was more important to win the peace than to win elections.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is the decision our President has made. That is the decision I will support, and that is why I will oppose this resolution.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. SKELTON], for a dialog.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, does he agree with me that there has been no credible answer or response to my raising the issue of arming and training the Bosnian Moslems, which puts our troops at risk?

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would respond to the gentleman that there has been no credible response in this debate to his question.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois, HENRY HYDE, for the perspective of a former commander of the naval reserves, a hero of World War II.

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, very simply, this is a good resolution. It does two things: It expresses the dissent that so many of us feel from the policy implemented by the President in Bosnia. That is all it does.

It does not cut any funds, as the Dornan resolution did. In fact, it supports giving our troops all of the resources necessary to carry out their mission safely. So it fully expresses my own views, although I did support the Dornan resolution as the last, best, and only opportunity to keep our young men from going into this morass of ethnic and religious hatred that has been simmering for over 500 years on the off chance that they are out of breath now and they have a cease-fire.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution perfectly states my views in opposition but in support of the troops. So I strongly support and urge my colleagues support for the Buyer-Skelton resolution.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me extend a compliment to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI], for his demeanor and his statesmanlike conduct in how he has handled the debate. Just let me compliment the gentleman for that.

This is a debate about two very distinct views of foreign policy. There are those of us who tie the use of military

to vital national security interests because we believe that placing troops in harm's way on foreign soil is of no ordinary magnitude. The other is the Clinton administration would like for the United States to become the world's policeman and the guarantor of global security.

U.S. troops should only be used on the ground to ensure regional security, not to intervene in civil wars which have no real threat of spreading to that instability of a region. While I have heard the argument, it rings hollow.

The United States, as the world's only superpower must exercise a policy of restraint in our involvement in conflicts overseas. Ours is a responsibility to provide overall military and economic security to regions of the world. If the United States intervenes in intracontinental conflicts, regional powers are allowed to escape their responsibilities.

When will Europe take a role in policing its own region? The answer is when Europe no longer has the expectation that the United States will be there to rescue them whenever they have a problem.

Mr. Speaker, we are closing this century now. For the fourth time, the United States will be on the ground in Europe. Think of that, for the fourth time. Truly, Europe can be a quarrelsome bunch and the United States leadership in NATO unifies and strengthens Europe. But as my colleagues know, the United States must send a message that the post-cold-war policies and doctrine for the security of Europe must reflect 1995, not 1945.

The United States has a key and vital role to play in the peace process, and I compliment the President of the United States for bringing the parties to the table. The role for which we should play is do not put troops on the ground.

The United States should act responsibly in the cohesion of NATO; the IFOR commander should be a commander from Europe, not the United States. The United States should supply our air power, our seapower, our airlift, our sealift, our intelligence, the architecture of intelligence from the sky and our satellites and logistics, but not that on the ground. However, when U.S. forces deploy on the ground as peacekeepers, we go there without the protection of neutrality, and they become targets and casualties.

There are those who have claimed the moral obligation. Well, let me say this. When we view disasters in this country, whether it be by tornado, hurricane, earthquake, fire, you name it, we see that destruction and it is repulsive to us, but we understand it because we say it is a natural disaster. However, when we look and view what mankind can do to one another, it is violent to our values. But if we permit our foreign policy to be guided by our hearts, then the United States will find our troops in over 67 hot spots throughout the world.

If we want the United States to become the world's policeman, just say so. I do not believe that the United States can be the world's policeman.

When I was in Sarajevo, a mother, yes, cried and wept in my arms to communicate to me that she lost a son. That is moving to me. But it is also just as moving when I go to the funerals of American soldiers and have to be able to look into the eyes of an American mother and be able to communicate to her that her son or her daughter has given that life to protect vital national security interests. That is why we tie foreign troops' commitments to vital national security interests, because we cannot be everywhere in the world.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is very clear. It is clear because we say we are reiterating a policy from before, where we stated we oppose U.S. ground troops. We want to intervene, but we do not agree with that policy. We believe we have the confidence in these troops that they will do their job. They are gallant, they are brave and they are courageous.

We also do not want a repeat of Somalia. I have spoken with a father who lost his son. We do not want that.

We want the President and the Secretary of Defense to rely upon the field commanders when they make military decisions. We also want to make sure they get the resources and the equipment they need to do their job.

Last is a paradox, and that is if we are going to arm and train the Moslems, then we should take sides. And if we do that, then we do not go on the ground. If we want to go on the ground, then we do not arm and train the Moslems. But to do both or to claim that somehow we will get other countries to do it, and our pawprints are all over it, subjects and opens our American soldiers to become targets and casualties, and it is wrong.

Please support the Buyer-Skelton resolution. God bless us all.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, as the tragedy of the Balkan conflict has unfolded before us in the newspapers, on television, and here, on the floor of the House, I have spent many hours talking with constituents, talking to colleagues, and thinking through the appropriate United States response, as well as the appropriate role for Congress. I continue to believe that the deployment of U.S. ground troops is the wrong approach. I do think the United States has an interest in stopping the fighting and in preserving NATO. But I also believe that military instability in Bosnia and Herzegovina presents tantamount risk to our ground troops and throws into question the achievability of our mission there. A more appropriate U.S. role might have been limited to logistical support and providing air cover.

It is, of course, crucial that Congress voice its support for our troops, for our young men and women who are already in Bosnia. And as much as I disagree with President Clinton about some of his foreign policy decisions, I think when you elect a President as Commander in Chief, you have to give some flexibility.

Tonight I will reluctantly vote against H.R. 2770, Representative DORAN's bill to cut off all funding for our troops, primarily because I think it is not fair to our men and women in uniform who are already there. It would be irresponsible for Congress to jeopardize the safety of those already deployed and the thousands more that are in the process of being deployed—regardless of this vote—in the coming weeks. I think of Annah Castellini, a constituent and graduate of West Point, who is headed to Bosnia soon as a platoon leader. Remembering the Vietnam era, she worries about whether the American people will support her.

Further, I do feel that the passage of H.R. 2770 begins to infringe on the President's power as Commander in Chief and could threaten confidence in U.S. leadership. I think it would be unwise at this time to send conflicting messages to the factions of the Balkan conflict and the rest of the world.

In my opinion, the Buyer resolution, House Resolution 302, strikes a better balance between opposing the decision to send them, yet supporting our troops in their duties. I will support Buyer. I cannot support House Resolution 306, the Hamilton resolution, because it implicitly expresses support, not just for the troops, but also for the President's decision to send them.

Former President Bush said recently, "Sincere people can have honest differences as to whether President Clinton has made the right decision. I am nevertheless certain in my mind that at this point we must support our troops—and that support should come from Republicans and Democrats alike." I agree. As one who believes President Clinton made the wrong decision, I nonetheless will support our troops in any way I can and pray for their safe return.

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening in support of the resolution offered by my colleagues from Indiana and Missouri.

Earlier tonight, I voted against the resolution sponsored by my colleague from California because it sent the wrong message to our troops already in Bosnia, as well as those on their way in the coming days. We cannot take away their ability to defend themselves.

I strongly support the Buyer-Skelton resolution which expresses our opposition to the President's Bosnia mission. Yet, this resolution does so without undermining our troops already there, and those troops that will be there by the time this resolution is agreed to by both the House and Senate. This resolution specifically states that our troops in Bosnia will have the resources and support they need to protect themselves until we bring them home.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING). Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 304, the previous question is ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 287, nays 141, answered "present" 1, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 857]

## YEAS—287

Abercrombie Franks (CT) Montgomery  
 Allard Franks (NJ) Moorhead  
 Andrews Frelinghuysen Morella  
 Archer Frisa Myrick  
 Arney Funderburk Nethercutt  
 Bachus Gallegly Neumann  
 Baker (CA) Ganske Ney  
 Baker (LA) Gekas Norwood  
 Baldacci Geren Nussle  
 Ballenger Gilchrest Ortiz  
 Barcia Gillmor Oxley  
 Barrett (NE) Gilman Packard  
 Bartlett Gingrich Parker  
 Barton Gonzalez Paxon  
 Bass Goodlatte Payne (VA)  
 Bentsen Goodling Peterson (MN)  
 Bereuter Gordon Pombo  
 Bilbray Goss Porter  
 Billrakis Graham Portman  
 Bishop Green Pryce  
 Bliley Greenwood Quinn  
 Blute Gunderson Radanovich  
 Boehlert Gutknecht Ramstad  
 Boehner Hall (TX) Regula  
 Bonilla Hancock Riggs  
 Bono Hansen Rivers  
 Brewster Hastert Roberts  
 Browder Hastings (WA) Roemer  
 Brownback Hayes Rogers  
 Bryant (TN) Hayworth Ros-Lehtinen  
 Bryant (TX) Hefley Roth  
 Bunn Heineman Roukema  
 Bunning Herger Royce  
 Burr Hilleary Salmon  
 Burton Hobson Sanders  
 Buyer Hoekstra Sanford  
 Callahan Holden Saxton  
 Calvert Horn Schaefer  
 Camp Schiff Schiffr  
 Canady Hunter Schroeder  
 Castle Hutchinson Schumer  
 Chabot Hyde Seastrand  
 Chambliss Inglis Sensenbrenner  
 Chapman Istook Serrano  
 Chenoweth Jacobs Shadegg  
 Christensen Jefferson Shaw  
 Chrysler Johnson (CT) Shays  
 Clinger Johnson (SD) Shuster  
 Coble Johnson, Sam Skeen  
 Coburn Jones Skelton  
 Collins (GA) Kaptur Smith (MI)  
 Collins (IL) Kasich Smith (NJ)  
 Combest Kelly Smith (TX)  
 Condit Kim Smith (WA)  
 Cooley King Solomon  
 Costello Kingston Souder  
 Cox Kleczka Spence  
 Cramer Knollenberg Spratt  
 Crane Kolbe Stark  
 Crapo LaHood Stearns  
 Cremeans Largent Stenholm  
 Cubin Latham Stockman  
 Cunningham LaTourette Stump  
 Danner Laughlin Talent  
 Davis Lazio Tanner  
 de la Garza Leach Tate  
 Deal Lewis (CA) Tauzin  
 DeFazio Lewis (KY) Taylor (MS)  
 DeLay Lightfoot Taylor (NC)  
 Dickey Lincoln Tejeda  
 Doggett Linder Thomas  
 Doolittle Lipinski Thornberry  
 Dornan Livingston Thurman  
 Doyle LoBiondo Tiahrt  
 Dreier Lofgren Torkildsen  
 Duncan Longley Traficant  
 Dunn Luther Upton  
 Durbin Manton Vucanovich  
 Edwards Manzullo Waldholtz  
 Ehlers Martini Walker  
 Ehrlich McCarthy Walsh  
 Emerson McCollum Wamp  
 English McCrery Watts (OK)  
 Ensign McDade Weldon (FL)  
 Evans McHale Weldon (PA)  
 Everett McHugh Weller  
 Ewing McIntosh White  
 Fawell McKeon Whitfield  
 Fields (LA) McNulty Wicker  
 Fields (TX) Menendez Wise  
 Filner Metcalf Wolf  
 Flanagan Meyers Wyden  
 Foley Mica Young (AK)  
 Forbes Miller (FL) Young (FL)  
 Fowler Minge Zimmer  
 Fox Molinari

## NAYS—141

Ackerman Hamilton Owens  
 Baesler Harman Pallone  
 Barr Hastings (FL) Pastor  
 Barrett (WI) Hefner Payne (NJ)  
 Becerra Hilliard Pelosi  
 Beilenson Hinchey Peterson (FL)  
 Berman Hoke Petri  
 Bevil Houghton Pickett  
 Bonior Hoyer Pomeroy  
 Borski Jackson-Lee Poshard  
 Boucher Johnson, E. B. Quillen  
 Brown (CA) Johnston Rahall  
 Brown (FL) Kanjorski Rangel  
 Brown (OH) Kennedy (MA) Reed  
 Cardin Kennedy (RI) Richardson  
 Clay Kennelly Rohrabacher  
 Clayton Kildee Rose  
 Clement Klink Roybal-Allard  
 Clyburn Klug Rush  
 Coleman LaFalce Sabo  
 Collins (MI) Lantos Sawyer  
 Conyers Levin Scarborough  
 Coyne Lewis (GA) Scott  
 DeLauro Lowey Sisisky  
 Dellums Maloney Skaggs  
 Deutsch Markey Slaughter  
 Diaz-Balart Martinez Stokes  
 Dicks Mascara Studds  
 Dingell Matsui Stupak  
 Dixon McDermott Thompson  
 Dooley McKinney Thornton  
 Engel Meehan Torres  
 Eshoo Meek Torricelli  
 Farr Mfume Towns  
 Fattah Miller (CA) Vento  
 Fazio Mink Visclosky  
 Flake Moakley Volkmer  
 Foglietta Mollohan Ward  
 Ford Moran Waters  
 Frank (MA) Murtha Watt (NC)  
 Frost Myers Waxman  
 Furse Nadler Williams  
 Gejdenson Neal Wilson  
 Gephardt Oberstar Woolsey  
 Gibbons Obey Wynn  
 Gutierrez Olver Yates  
 Hall (OH) Orton Zeliff

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Bateman

## NOT VOTING—4

Lucas Tucker  
 McInnis Velazquez

## □ 2214

Mr. SCARBOROUGH changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I wish unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution just considered, and that I may include extraneous material for the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. BUNNING). Pursuant to section 4 of House Resolution 304, it is now in order to consider a resolution offered by the minority leader, or his designee.

## □ 2215

## SENSE OF HOUSE REGARDING DEPLOYMENT OF ARMED FORCES TO BOSNIA

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 304, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 306) expressing the Sense of the House of Representatives regarding the deployment of United States Armed Forces in Bosnia, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of House Resolution 306 is as follows:

## H. RES. 306

Whereas the President of the United States pledged to commit the United States Armed Forces to participate in implementing a peace agreement in Bosnia and Herzegovina;

Whereas the United States hosted Proximity Talks in Dayton, Ohio, from November 1, 1995 through November 21, 1995, for the purpose of allowing the negotiation of a peaceful settlement to the longstanding conflict in the former Yugoslavia;

Whereas the Proximity Talks concluded with the Presidents of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Republic of Croatia, and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia initialing a General Framework Agreement for Peace on November 21, 1995;

Whereas the Presidents of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Republic of Croatia, and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia have requested a NATO-led implementation force with United States participation and have pledged full cooperation with this force;

Whereas some Members of Congress have questions and concerns about certain aspects of the peace implementation process; and

Whereas the Congress joins the President in wanting to minimize the risks to the United States Armed Forces helping to implement the peace agreement in the former Yugoslavia by ensuring that they have the necessary resources and other support to perform their mission effectively: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives unequivocally supports the men and women of the United States Armed Forces who are carrying out their mission in support of peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina with professional excellence, dedicated patriotism, and exemplary bravery.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4 of House Resolution 304, the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. HAMILTON], and the gentleman from New York, [Mr. GILMAN], each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON].

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support House Resolution 306. It is a very simple and straightforward resolution. Its purpose is simply to support the troops and to praise them for the work they are doing and will do. It does two things in its operative clause. It gives unequivocal support to the men and women of the United States Armed Forces and praises them for the work that they are doing and will do in support of peace in Bosnia. The resolution is intended to be silent with regard to policy, and the whereas clauses of the resolution merely recite facts. The resolution is intended to be silent with regard to policy, neither for the policy